

REV. MICHAEL WEMPE

**DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY THE ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES 2013
PURSUANT TO JCCP 4286 SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

Vicar for Clergy Database

Clergy Assignment Record (Detailed)

Mr Michael E. Wempe

Current Primary Assignment

<i>Birth Date</i>	11/1/1939	<i>Age:</i>	73
<i>Birth Place</i>	Estherville, Iowa, USA	<i>Deanery:</i>	0
<i>Diaconate Ordination</i>			
<i>Priesthood Ordination</i>	4/30/1966		
<i>Diocese Name</i>	Archdiocese of Los Angeles		
<i>Date of Incardination</i>	5/1/1963		
<i>Religious Community</i>			
<i>Ritual Ascription</i>	Latin		
<i>Ministry Status</i>	Dismissed from Clerical State		
<i>Canon State</i>	Diocesan Priest	<i>Incard Process</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Begin Pension Date</i>			

<i>Home phone</i>	(562) 594-5011
<i>Seminary</i>	St. John's Seminary, Camarillo
<i>Ethnicity</i>	American (USA)
<i>Language(s)</i>	<i>Fluency</i>
Spanish	Conversational Basics

Fingerprint Verification and Safeguard Training

Date Background Check
Virtus Training Date

Assignment History

<i>Assignment</i>	<i>Beginning Date</i>	<i>Completion Date</i>
Dismissed from Clerical State, Rescript from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Prot. No. 659/2004-23647.	6/30/2006	
Retired with No Faculties, NO FACULTIES. OUT OF PRIESTLY MINISTRY	2/15/2002	6/29/2006
Cathedral Chapel, Los Angeles Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	2/1/2002	2/14/2002
Immaculate Heart of Mary Catholic Church, Los Angeles Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	10/15/1998	1/31/2001
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles Chaplain, Active Service	1/18/1988	2/14/2002
St. Ambrose Catholic Church, West Hollywood Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	1/18/1988	10/14/1998

Sick Leave	7/1/1987	1/17/1988
St. Sebastian Catholic Church, Santa Paula Administrator Pro Tem, Active Service	2/1/1987	6/30/1987
Vatican II Institute, Rome, Sabbatical	9/1/1986	12/1/1986
St. Sebastian Catholic Church, Santa Paula Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	7/9/1984	1/31/1987
St. Mary Catholic Church, Palmdale Resident, Resident	2/20/1978	7/8/1984
Paraclete High School, Lancaster Education-Teacher/Faculty, Active Service	2/20/1978	7/8/1984
Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Ventura Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	6/17/1977	2/19/1978
St. Jude Catholic Church, Westlake Village Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	6/11/1973	6/16/1977
St. Rose of Lima Catholic Church, Simi Valley Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	9/2/1969	6/10/1973
St. Andrew Catholic Church, Pasadena Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	3/25/1969	9/1/1969
St. John Chrysostom Catholic Church, Inglewood Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	5/14/1966	3/24/1969

SKB J.D.R.
TK
AHB
1/1/1

February 2, 1978

Your Eminence:


This date I interviewed Father Michael Wempe.

- 1) I indicated the difficulties I have had in trying to place him in the Ventura County area;
- 2) I told him that three separate priests had recommended that I suggest that he have professional help, primarily due to difficulties we have heard existed in rectories to which he has been assigned.

Monsignor Rawden

REDACTED

1974



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015
388-8101

February 10, 1978

Reverend Michael J. Moran
St. Mary's Church
P. O. box 850
Palmdale, California 93550

Dear Father Moran:

His Eminence, Cardinal Manning, has directed me to
confirm the appointment of

REVEREND MICHAEL WEMPE

to be in residence at St. Mary's Church, with faculties of an
Associate. Father Wempe has been appointed to teach at
Paraclete High School.

This assignment will become effective on Monday,
February 20, 1978.

It is the mind of His Eminence, the Cardinal, that Father
Wempe should cooperate as much as possible in the parish work
and that he should receive \$25.00 per month from the parish to
assist in the maintenance of his automobile.

Sincerely yours in Christ


Reverend Monsignor John A. Rawden
Chancellor

REDACTED

254739

JUN-17-2002 06:59 PM ST. MARY'S CHURCH

REDACTED

P. 04



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 388-8101

June 19, 1984

Reverend Michael Wempe
Saint Mary's Church
P.O. Box 850
Palmdale, California 93550

Dear Father Wempe:

Enclosed is your official appointment as

ASSOCIATE PASTOR

to Monsignor Matthew H. Kelly, SAINT SEBASTIAN CHURCH, Santa
Paula, which His Eminence, Cardinal Manning, has directed me
to forward to you.

This assignment will become effective on Thursday,
July 12, 1984.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

John A. Rawden
Reverend Monsignor John A. Rawden
Chancellor

REDACTED, encl
cc: REDACTED REDACTED

, Paraclete High School

254740

REFERRAL MEMORANDUM FROM ARCHBISHOP ROGER MAHONY

F. Michael Wenzel
Date: 5-15-87TO: Msgr. Curry

- () Please review, then SEE me
- () Please review, then RETURN to me
- () Please review, then SEND me your COMMENTS
- (X) Please review, then FILE

- () Please handle this matter entirely
- () Please answer; send copy of letter to me
- () Please write a reply for my signature
- () For your information

- () Please XEROX and send copy/copies to: _____

- () original to file
- () original back to me

REMARKS: Fr. Mike Wenzel's current psychologist.Thanks!

1975

Fr. Mike Wempe's
Therapist:

REDACTED

D.R.

REDACTED

Wed, 6/10 } before 10:00 am
 } after 5:00 pm

1) send report - needs address

2) willing to speak in person
with staff at REDACTED

1973

REDACTED REDACTED

Clinical Psychologist

REDACTED *Mike Wenge*

REDACTED

1972

REFERRAL MEMORANDUM F. ARCHBISHOP ROGER MAHONY

F. Michael Wenge
Date: 5-15-87Fr. Mike Wenge's
therapist:

REDACTED

D.R.

REDACTED

REDACTED

Wed, 6/10 } before 10:00 am
 } after 5:00 pm

1) send report - needs address

2) willing to speak in person
with staff at Jerseyne
IN to me
me your COM

REDACTED REDACTED

Clinical Psychologist
DACTED

Mike Wenge

REDACTED

entirely
of letter
my signature

y/copies to

me

is current psychologist

Thanks!

1971



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
(213) 251-3284

May 19, 1987

Rev. Michael Wempe
St. Sebastian Church
235 North Ninth St.
Santa Paula, CA 93060

Dear Father Mike:

As I mentioned to you when we met recently, there is a certain concern about your staying on at St. Sebastian. A transition to a new pastor is always a somewhat challenging time, both for a parish and for a pastor. I believe we discussed that your presence there, especially in view of how involved you were with the parish and how much you wanted to be pastor will of necessity add complications.


In talking this over with the Personnel Board, the members expressed a very strong interest in seeing you in order to have a chance to discuss with you not only this situation but also your own future plans.

The Board will meet next on Wednesday, June 3, and I would very much appreciate it if you could come to talk with them at that time.

If that is possible for you, would you please call my office to make an appointment at a time that morning that would be suitable for you.

Look forward to seeing you.

Sincerely yours,


(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

REDACTED

1970



St. Sebastian's Church

235 NORTH NINTH STREET
SANTA PAULA, CALIFORNIA 93060
TELEPHONE (805) 525-2149

May 20, 1987

His Excellency
Archbishop Roger Mahony
1531 W. Ninth St.
Los Angeles, Cal. 90015-1194

Your Excellency:

I wish to again thank you for our meeting on Friday, May 15 and the subsequent clarification of my status here at St. Sebastian's on Monday, May 18. As you mentioned Monday, my stress level has been lowered considerably!

I did, however, receive a letter from Msgr. Curry's office (a copy of which is enclosed), dated a day after our last conversation, which puzzles me somewhat. In an attempt to clarify this matter, I called REDACTED at Msgr. Curry's office today, May 20, and thankfully, in view of my two conversations with you, she suggested that I disregard the letter unless I heard differently from their office.

Again, thank you for your brotherly concern for me and my priesthood and be most assured of my continued prayer for you.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Rev. Michael E. Wempe

1969



St. Sebastian's Church

235 NORTH NINTH STREET
SANTA PAULA, CALIFORNIA 93060
TELEPHONE (805) 525-2149

May 22, 1987

Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. Curry
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Dear Tom,

This is not going to be an easy letter to write. Before I get into the matter, I would like to assure you that the young man who just got out of jail has found a place to stay and has already lined up a full time job in a meat market plus a part time job helping a man remodel his home.

The reason for my writing at this time, however, is something which I discussed at great length with Fr. REDACTED who suggested that I write to you and also notify REDACTED of the problem. Since Mike and I have had a great deal of friction I had hesitated in bringing this up, wondering if it would just be mud slinging on my part. But since REDACTED has made me aware of how sensitive the board is to matters of scandal involving priests in sex related issues, I feel that my silence can no longer be justified.

Before I begin, I want to affirm that no one, to my knowledge, has made any accusations. But the potential for danger appears to me to be very great.

When I came here, there was a king size bed in my bedroom. I used only half of it. Meanwhile, Mike was sleeping diagonally on a double size bed. I suggested that we switch beds, since I didn't need such a big bed and he could easily use one. So we switched beds on the Saturday after Easter. After we had moved his bed into my room, the housekeeper came in and told me that I should throw out that double size mattress and buy a new one. I asked her why, since it appeared all right to me. She then told me that two years ago Mike had a ten year old boy sleeping with him and the kid wet the bed and soaked the mattress. I saw no stain on it, so I have kept the mattress.

Just about a week ago, she again repeated her urging. I told her that I didn't see any reason to throw it out because it was only wet on once. She then said: "No, Father, it happened at least three times that I know of." She told me the boy had brought a sleeping bag with him, but it was never used and she would find the bed soaking wet.

1965

I am pretty certain that this is the same boy that Mike took with him, just the two of them, in his house-trailer from April 20th to the 22nd, this year. He played golf here on the 22nd and then left again the next morning in his trailer with two other boys, who are brothers, ages 7 and 12. They too were gone for two days. Though I have no evidence that anything improper occurred, the whole situation seems extremely imprudent.

There is another aspect of his relationship with these boys that disturbs me, and that is the issue of firearms. About two weeks ago, the public school teacher of this seven year old child called on the phone, seeking advice. She was disturbed by the anger and hatred that this boy has exhibited in class, both in his conduct and in his written work. The child's father, REDACTED

REDACTED The child has never accepted it. What disturbed the teacher, among other things, was a story that the child wrote about shooting and killing a rattlesnake with a gun. He said that it made him feel good when he did that. The teacher was wondering if she should bring this matter up with the child's mother, since she knew there was already a lot of stress in the home. But the teacher also expressed astonishment that any adult would let a seven year old child, especially one that is so angry, shoot a gun.

It came as a shocker to me when I realized that Mike was the one she was talking about, even though she was unaware of it. Mike told me that they had killed a rattlesnake when they were away during Easter week, and he even showed me the snake's skin. I have trouble with the idea of priests teaching children to shoot guns, apart from the question of this particular child's emotional problems.

How much and how many people know about the matters I have related here I would have no way of knowing. Mike is still very much involved with the three boys mentioned above. I would judge that his association with them is rather widely known, since he usually schedules them to serve only at his Masses and he is very close friends with their families.

I have discussed this situation with REDACTED He asked that I relay in this letter that he would like you to contact him about this matter as soon as possible. There are other details which he can relate to you, including names which I do not wish to put in writing.

Sincerely yours,
REDACTED

Rev. REDACTED

cc REDACTED

1966



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3288

Office of the Archbishop

May 29, 1987

Reverend Michael Wempe
St. Sebastian's Church
235 N. Ninth Street
Santa Paula, CA 93060

Dear Mike:

I am grateful to you for your letter of May 20th and I am pleased to know that your own personal situation and assignment status are stabilized and that your own stress level has lowered.

I believe that it is still important for you to continue your discussions with the Personnel Board and with Monsignor Curry since they are so integrally bound up in the whole process of assignments.

Given your health situation and other personal concerns, I would hope that we might be able to make your next transfer a more permanent one as a pastor. At the same time, I appreciate your flexibility and openness to the realities and timing involved in all assignments.

I sincerely hope that you are pursuing both your REDACTED evaluation as well as a more thorough diagnosis of the REDACTED condition. I remain very open to have you go to Scripps in San Diego in order to arrive at a fuller understanding of your actual health condition and what might be done to give you greater assignment possibilities with respect to geographical locations.

Assuring you of my prayers and with every best wish, I am

Fraternaly yours in Christ,

+ *Roger Mahony*

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

ga

cc: Monsignor Curry

1968

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 2, 1987
FROM: Msgr. Curry ✓
TO: Archbishop Mahony
RE: St. Sebastian, Santa Paula

The situation at St. Sebastian continues to deteriorate.

I am in contact with REDACTED regarding the matter
raised by Father REDACTED (attached).

However, I thought you should be aware of these very
serious allegations.

We need to move on this.

+ RAK

6-5-87

1964



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

COPY

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
(213) 251-3284

June 16, 1987

REDACTED Ph.D.
REDACTED

Dear Dr. REDACTED

Archbishop Mahony spoke to me after his conversation with you last week, and he told me you would be willing to send a report regarding Father Michael Wempe to the Servants of the Paraclete in New Mexico, and also that you would be willing to speak in person with one of the staff there.

I very much appreciate your offer of assistance. The address is:

Servants of the Paraclete
Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025
Telephone: REDACTED

You may send the report in care of Father REDACTED there.

I will also inform the program that you are willing to speak with one of the staff persons and give them your number in case they wish to contact you.

Again, with many thanks for your assistance in this matter I remain

Yours sincerely,


(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

REDACTED

CONFIDENTIAL

ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 1531 WEST NINTH STREET
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
 (213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
 (213) 251-3284

June 17, 1987

REDACTED

Jemez Springs
 New Mexico 87025

Dear REDACTED

Since Father Michael Wempe is going to Jemez Springs on Monday, June 22 for the diagnostic program there, I am sending you some background information. We hope that as a result of the diagnostic tests, the program there will be able to accept and assist him.

Earlier this year, Father Wempe applied for the pastorate of St. Sebastian parish in Santa Paula. He was not appointed, but the whole process of the appointment of a pastor to the parish and subsequent events there have brought his life increasingly under review by several people.

At a public hearing in the parish before the selection of a new pastor, attended by about 120 persons), it emerged that some people were very much in favor of Father Wempe's being appointed pastor. They cited his excellent qualities: his ability to work with youth, his liveliness, preaching, liturgy, etc. It also emerged that others were very much opposed to such an appointment. They saw him as being a part of the problems in the parish and said that what the parish needed was a whole new start. It would be difficult to estimate the numbers in either of these groups, but they were definitely distinct entities.

When Father Wempe came to the Personnel Board for his interview, the members were surprised--I might even say distressed--as a result of the meeting. They found him "hyper," extraordinarily emotionally attached to the parish. He seemed to emphasize that he was totally loved by the people, and yet when they asked him about how to reconcile with those who disagreed with him or did not want him as pastor, he seemed to have a completely unrealistic assessment of his ability to do so.

The Board was so unfavorably impressed that none of its members would even consider recommending him for the pastorate.

1960

REDACTED

-2

I make no judgment about subsequent events. However, I would point out that Father Wempe's behavior since the appointment of a new pastor has not been conducive to the latter's really taking over and getting a hold on the assignment. For instance, Father Mike wept in introducing him at all the Masses and let the people know how disappointed he had been in his failure to get the appointment.

There have also been many and fairly severe conflicts with the new pastor, though I repeat that I am making no judgment as to blame in this instance. The Board members, however, have felt strongly for some time that it is essential that Father Mike be away from St. Sebastian.

His history of conflict in parishes goes back a long way. There are several letters in the files, some indicating extreme approbation for him but others very critical of him. There is one note saying that Monsignor Rawden, the former Chancellor, interviewed him in February 1978 and told him then that three separate priests had recommended he receive professional help, primarily because of difficulties existing in rectories.

A number of priests have expressed admiration for Father Mike's love of the Liturgy, for his preaching, and his ability to relate to young people. However, the other side they see is an inability to deal with authority--especially pastors' authority--and his going into almost uncontrollable rage when challenged on this. They have pointed out an absolute determination on his part to take over, to use very strong language about pastors, about hierarchical authority, about any kind of authority that seems to challenge his own.

He has had difficulty working with staff members in parishes. They have claimed he was irrational, insulting, and impossible to work with. Some of these complaints are that things he does not like to do, e.g., visiting hospital, he simply dismisses and says "that's not my thing" and utterly refuses to do them.

While he cares about the Liturgy and is talented in that area, again, some of the complaints have been that it absolutely had to be handled his way, that no one could discuss planning or anything else with him.

There are also complaints about violent verbal attacks on pastors, abusive language, screaming, and rage. He seems to have an extraordinary hunger for popularity and affirmation.

There does run through the complaints about him the allegation that he does not make prudent judgments, that his behavior tends to alienate and upset people and get them unreasonably angry with him, and that, possibly, he does this to get their attention.

1961

REDACTED

-3

During an interview with him, the Archbishop mentioned that there is no place he could get the Personnel Board to recommend Mike for now, either as pastor or in any other capacity. I believe this to be the case and feel his reputation is such that the vast majority of priests in the Archdiocese would be nervous or fearful of working with him.

Incidentally, Father Mike has been going to see a psychologist for the past several years:

REDACTED


REDACTED has said he would indeed be willing to send a report to Jemez Springs if needed and also willing to talk to one of the staff persons there if that would be helpful. He comes highly recommended by several priests in the Archdiocese.

In addition to the complaints about conflicts in rectories, there is another issue surrounding Father Wempe that tends to be more serious, although there is less hard evidence on it and I must admit that most of it is conjecture and rumor. However the rumors tend to be both consistent and persistent, and they deal with his relationship with small boys or with teenagers. It is true that he does--according to his own admission--spend much of his free time with minors. He has allowed these minors (we believe some of them may be as young as seven years old) to use firearms.

He has also had minors stay overnight in his present assignment. They spent the time in his room, and there are allegations that they spent time also in his bed. He has continued to have minors in his room, though not staying overnight, and specifically had one in his room after the Regional Bishop has asked the pastor to see that he did not do such a thing.

He has had a teenage boy live with him in a trailer during one of his assignments. There is also an allegation--and this one involves a specific person--that he did touch a person improperly a number of years ago, when the person was still a minor. Again, I would emphasize the existence of a consistent and persistent belief on the part of a number of priests that he has had improper and imprudent relationships with minors.

Because of concern about these relationships and because of his consistent inability to relate with other priests, the Archdiocese feels the time has come when he simply must have help if he is to continue to make use of the many talents he has and to minister fruitfully in the Archdiocese. I wish to be fair and candid in this assessment, and I would be most willing to elaborate on anything in this letter or speak to any of your staff persons if that were deemed useful.

Sincerely yours,

 (Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
 Vicar for Clergy

1962

PERSONAL HISTORY SHEET
FOUNDATION HOUSE
SERVANTS OF THE PARACLETE
JEMEZ SPRINGS, NEW MEXICO 87025

Name: Michael Edwin Wempe

Date: June 19, 1987

Current Address: REDACTED

Telephone Number REDACTED

Referred to Foundation House by: Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Date of Birth: Nov. 1, 1939

Place of Birth: REDACTED

Age: 47

Most Recent Occupation: Catholic Priest

Education (Places & dates):

Grade school: REDACTED

High school:

College:

Seminary: St. John's Seminary, Camarillo, CA - 1962-1966

Degrees: Master of Arts in Comparative Religions. (1 class and project short of Master of Science in Marriage, Family and Child Counseling.)

Other Educational Experiences: Pastoral Spanish Institute (3 months).
Loyola Marymount Continuing Education for Priests (1 day a week for 2 years).
Vatican II Institute for Priests, 1986.

Date of Ordination: April 30, 1966

YOUR FAMILY

REDACTED

LIFE HISTORY/Rev. Michael Wempe

(5)

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED I was probably considered the athlete of the class. I am aware now that I even then felt that I could find security and acceptance from younger boys. Again, there was no sex involved.

1948

LIFE HISTORY/Rev. Michael Wempe

(6)

AFTER ORDINATION: REDACTED
REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

there was
also a young boy whom I took camping and we did sleep together. There was no
sex, but I am sure that I cuddled with him. To me, he felt "safe", while the
woman did not. REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED I have never had or allowed
these boys to do anything to me sexually. We have slept together, not been
afraid that we might accidentally touch each other, we have been at ease.

FINAL MAJOR EVENT: REDACTED
REDACTED

REDACTED I do not want to be a person who is unsafe
around kids.. I love my priesthood and want to be effective with all ages and
not fear my relationships with any age, especially the young. I want to
continue to serve in Los Angeles.

REDACTED

LIFE HISTORY/Rev. Michael Wempe

(7)

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED REDACTED The young man that lived with me for a period of time. There was no sex whatsoever, but I deeply loved him and he deeply loved me. We did sleep together until he felt he was too old. We always hugged and were never afraid to touch each other (non-sexually).

REDACTED

1950

LIFE HISTORY/Rev. Michael Wempe

(8)

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

my commitment with youth. especially boys who need a strong father figure.
REDACTED

REDACTED I need to assure those who are concerned that I am not doing
evil things with kids.

1951

REDACTED

What is your view of the future? (Include ambitions, desired work assignments, feelings).

I want to be an active priest in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, I want to be the pastor of a parish. I feel that I will be very good in this position. I want to understand, as said before, my relationship with people, myself and God.

REDACTED

This information has been disclosed to you from records whose confidentiality is protected by Federal Law Federal Regulation (42 CFR, Part 2) prohibiting from making any further disclosure except with the specific written consent of the person to whom it pertains, or as otherwise permitted by such regulations. A general authorization for the release of medical or other information is NOT sufficient for this purpose.

1956

EV. MICHAEL WEMPE

Notes June 25, 1987:

Conversation with REDACTED Jemez Springs. Mike has totally finessed his way through seven years of therapy. The report will not go to the psychologist here. He lied to the psychologist. Been involved with minors--presently with a 12-year-old--surrogate father but also sex partner. Pre-sexual--very serious
Furious at the psychologist
Last one to get into Foundation House Program
Afraid he might try suicide and watched him. Not afraid of that now.
Discuss with Bill Perri his coming back to L.A. before program starts.
"Mike has an insatiable need for closure."
Discussed aiding victims and the problem that might cause.
Mike said "People here would say 'let it go'"
Reported to Archbishop on same date by phone. REDACTED said Mike Wempe was terrified of Archbishop and of me. REDACTED calmed fears of this.

1959



Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025 (505) 829-3586

June 26, 1987

Most Reverend Roger Mahoney, D.D.
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahoney:

Reverend Michael Wempe a member of your Archdiocese will participate in our June - December program of renewal here at Foundation House. This letter contains information about the program, followup, and finances.

The program begins June 13, 1987 and will come to a close on December 4, 1987.

I ask that you write a letter to us describing the difficulties which have brought Michael to this point in his life. If others can add to this description, we would like to hear from them also. These letters will be shown to Michael by our psychiatrist or psychologist. In this way the participant can understand the difficulties in his life as described by a significant other. These letters are very important, and we consider them an integral part of the process here.

I will be sending progress reports concerning Michael every five weeks. These are confidential reports which are reviewed by him before they are sent to you. Michael will sign a "Release of Confidential Information" form before I send these reports to you.

I encourage you, or one of your representatives, to visit us while Michael is in the program. You will be able to observe the program and meet some of the staff. We have found these visits extremely helpful to the man as he works on his issues.

Over the past eleven years that we have been conducting this program we have consistently ~~seen~~ the need for followup. Therefore our program includes the following:

- 1) When Michael completes the program here in December, a member of our professional staff will return with him to his Archdiocese to do a Re-entry Workshop with the significant people in his life. The fee for this Workshop is \$200.00 plus expenses. We suggest that this Workshop take place within the first three months after he completes the program.

1957



2) A mandatory Followup Workshop of one week will take place here in early June, 1988.

3) There is a followup by telephone between completion of the program and the Followup Workshop.

4) During the 18 months after completion of the Followup Workshop, we are willing to do a one-day workshop in the place where Michael is living. This is optional and would be done at your request.

The fruits of the program are often seen only after the participant has spent some time back in his place of ministry. We are willing to do whatever we can to enable the person to help the program work for him and for those to whom he is ministering. This takes energy, time, and money, but the worthwhile results of proper followup are surely gratifying.

Numbers 1), 2), and 3) above are our contract with you. Number 4) is an optional service.

Our billing procedure is set up so that the payment of the invoice is due 15 days after receipt. Our fees per month, excluding costs for additional expense such as for physicians, are approximately \$3,000. You will receive a detailed accounting of each expenditure each month. Since we are not a licensed medical facility, usually the only fees that can be claimed on most group insurance policies are for the psychiatrist, the physician, medications, and psychologist REDACTED

are licensed in the State of New Mexico.) We are not set up, however, to process your insurance claims - we must let that be the responsibility of your own business manager.

Using funds from our annual drives, the Congregation of the Servants of the Paraclete donates a monthly subsidy to keep the total cost of the program as low as possible.

Please direct questions about billing to our Administrator, REDACTED

I wish to thank you for the confidence that you have placed in us by allowing Michael to come to our program. If at any time during the program you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Please continue to remember us in prayer as we perform this important and delicate ministry.

Sincerely in the Paraclete,

William A. Perri by Cheryl Staley

(Rev.) William A. Perri, S.P., M.A., D.Min.
Director

WDP:ss

1958

TC:

To refresh your memory. Mike Wempe called while you were away about the letter we sent him. He said he did not want to see the Personnel Board and did not want to make an appointment with them as the A.B. had assured him personally at two different times that he could stay on at St. Sebastian until he became a pastor and that was exactly what he intended to do.

I told him that if the A.B. had indeed told him that I could understand his confusion about our letter, that I would pass the information on to you, and that you would probably contact him as to further action but that he should not worry about it until and unless he heard from you.

That is not exactly SUGGESTING that he disregard the letter, but then word choice is always a problem.

REDACTED

June 14 1967

1967



Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025 (505) 829-3586

July 20, 1987

Most Rev. Roger Mahoney, D.D.
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West 9th Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahoney:


I have enclosed the report on the evaluation that was recently done here for Father Michael Wempe.

Mike has entered the program here with motivation and sincerity. He was very open and honest during the first week of the program in which we had autobiographies. Mike told the other members of the group why he is here and was able to trust this process. Because of this, I have hope that Mike will do well in the program.

Mike has requested, Archbishop, that this report be destroyed once you have read it.

I hope that this information is helpful to you.

Sincerely,


(Rev.) William D. Perri, S.P.
Director: Foundation House

1932



Reverend Michael Wempe

D.O.B.: 11/01/39

Referred by: Rev. William Perri, S.P., M.A., D.Min.

Referral Question: Psychological Evaluation & Testing

Sources of Evaluation: REDACTED

REDACTED

Place of Evaluation: Servants of the Paraclete

Foundation House

Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025

Date of Evaluation: June 24, 1987

Michael was referred for psychological evaluation for two major reasons: one REDACTED

REDACTED and secondarily, he was referred because of some rumors about some sexual acting out. He had not confirmed any of this sexual behavior, however, there were rumors and suspicions in the diocese concerning his behavior with young adolescent boys. REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

As the interview progressed, Michael began to discuss some of his behavior with young adolescent boys. As he told me more about this behavior, this became the sole focus of our interview. He described that he likes to cuddle and sleep in the same bed with young boys, that he has had long-term relationships with a few young boys that have lasted for as many as ten years. These relationships consists of his being the father to them that they have never had and most of these boys are people who have either no father or neglectful fathers. He attempts to be a father to them, providing them both with a male parental image, teaching them things such as to fire a gun and other classically masculine things as well as teaching them gentleness. He will sleep in the same bed with them often rubbing their backs. However, to the last statement he adds "that that's not what it's all about, that's not what I'm here for". By that, he means that it is not primarily out of sexual interest that he is

Psychological Evaluation/Rev. Michael Wempe

(2)

involved with these boys but that this is secondary to his own need to be cuddled and his need to father someone.

As we discussed his behavior with boys, Michael was very clear to assert that he did not see this behavior as primarily sexual and that furthermore, his psychologist (to the extent that he informed the psychologist of some of the past behaviors) did not see his problem as being primarily sexual, that he had seen Michael as "pre-sexual". Michael wanted to make it very clear that he had never harmed a boy and that the things that he did with them was out of love and could not be construed as being harmful. Michael did some very serious denying and minimizing as we discussed these issues. As I confronted him with the fact that I felt that there was both denial and minimization in a none too gentle fashion, Michael became extremely upset. REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED I had pointed out to him that some of the things that he had done were against the law and that he could conceivably face felony charges. He found this extremely upsetting. By the end of the session, he reported that this was the worst hour of his entire life. He was obviously extremely angry with me and found me to be quite cold, judgmental and uncaring. By the end of the session, he was still denying that he needed to be here and felt that he had made a major error in judgment by revealing as much as he had. From reports of professionals who saw him later in the week, his attitude about some of this softened and he was aware that he definitely needed help and that he had a real problem concerning sexuality. From talking to other people, it is my impression that his attitude about his sexuality, his need for help, and his pastorate in general is markedly changed from the time that I saw him and that as a result, many of the statements about his minimization and denial are no longer relevant to him.

REDACTED

Psychological Evaluation/Rev. Michael Wempe

(3)

REDACTED

Psychological Evaluation/Rev. Michael Wempe

(4)

REDACTED

REDACTED There seems no question that much of his sexual behavior is at least in part related to a need for intimacy that has never really been met in his life. However, he has completely ignored the sexual aspects to his behavior and has minimalized to a great extent the sexual needs that he has had. He is going to need to deal both with his needs for intimacy and his sexuality. REDACTED
REDACTED

REDACTED I strongly recommend his participation in the program at Foundation House. He has some major rationalizations to undo and some very real depression that he has not faced and it is going to be a very difficult process for him. He is going to need to both accept the consequences of his behavior for his own life and the fact that although he was telling himself that he had nothing but positive motives in his relationships with these boys, that some of his behavior may in fact have caused some very real harm. The reports that I have heard from other staff indicate that he had already begun by the end of the week the process of accepting the consequences of some of his behavior REDACTED
REDACTED

although clearly a major problem for him, seems secondary at this point to his sexual behavior. It seems quite likely that in the process of dealing with his sexual behavior he would also be able to work out some of his authority issues.
REDACTED

1936

Psychological Evaluation/Rev. Michael Wempe

(5)

Thank you for the opportunity of helping to evaluate Reverend Michael Wempe.

REDACTED

(Dictated, but not read)

This information has been disclosed to you from records whose confidentiality is protected by Federal Law. Federal Regulation (42 CFR, Part 2) prohibits you from making any further disclosure of it without the specific written consent of the person to whom it pertains, or as otherwise permitted by such regulations. A general authorization for the release of medical or other information is NOT sufficient for this purpose.

1937

FOUNDATION HOUSE
Jemez Springs, New Mexico,
87025

August 7, 1987

His Excellency,
Archbishop Roger Mahony
1531 W. Ninth St.
Los Angeles, Cal. 90015

Your Excellency:

I just wanted to touch bases with you and let you know that all is going well. The drive over was uneventful. I had rebuilt the engine in the 1969 G.M.C. myself and was very pleased with its performance on the trip over.

I have been here three full weeks now and am beginning to settle in. The schedule is very full and very demanding. Each day is begun with breakfast at 7:30 and often does not end until 9 P.M. I find the staff and other members of the module to be very easy to get along with. There are men from all over the country and each contributes his own gifts to the community.

I am becoming very aware of how much I have been giving to others and not really taking care of myself. In fact, except the fear of being looked down upon by other members of the clergy, I would feel that this extended period for prayer and self-evaluation would be beneficial for almost any priest.

Be assured of my continued prayer for you and please remember me once in a while at prayer.

Sincerely yours in Christ,



Rev. Michael E. Wempe

1931

FOUNDATION HOUSE
Jemez Springs, New Mexico,
87025

August 7, 1967

REDACTED

1531 W. Ninth St.
Los Angeles, Cal. 90015

Dear REDACTED

I just wanted to touch bases with you and let you know that all is going well. The drive over was uneventful. I had rebuilt the engine in the 1963 C.M.C. myself and was very pleased with its performance on the trip over.

I have been here three full weeks now and am beginning to settle in. The schedule is very full and very demanding. Each day is begun with breakfast at 7:30 and often does not end until 9 P.M. I find the staff and other members of the module to be very easy to get along with. There are men from all over the country and each contributes his own gifts to the community.

I am becoming very aware of how much I have been giving to others and not really taking care of myself. In fact, except the fear of being looked down upon by other members of the clergy, I would feel that this extended period for prayer and self-evaluation would be beneficial for almost any priest.

REDACTED

Thanks for your help in these matters.


Sincerely yours in Christ,

REDACTED



Rev. Michael E. Nempe

1929



1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194

OFFICE OF THE ARCHBISHOP

August 14, 1987

Reverend Michael E. Wempe
Foundation House
Jemez Springs, NM 87025

Dear Mike:

I was so very pleased to receive your recent letter and I am glad to know that you are finding the program at Foundation House to be so helpful and useful to you in your life as a priest.

You will recall that when I recommended that you go to Jemez Springs and participate in the program I said that you would find in the long run that it would be an extremely favorable and constructive experience for you. All of the priests whom I know and who have participated in the program relate that same experience, and when you conclude the program there you will find your own future ministry so much more challenging and fruitful.

Each of you there at Jemez Springs is very much in my prayers and I call you to mind each day during my celebration of the Eucharist.

Please continue to have your spirit of openness there at Foundation House and to allow the spirit to work through the various professionals as well as your brother priests.


Assuring you again of my prayers and of my support for you in this experience, and with every best wish, I am

Faternally yours in Christ,

Most Reverend Roger Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

REDACTED

1930



Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025 (505) 829-3586
August 17, 1987

Most Reverend Roger Mahony, D.D.
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony:

Here is the first report on Reverend Michael Wempe who is currently in the program at Foundation House.

REDACTED



Reverend Michael Wempe

(2)

REDACTED

PSYCHOLOGICAL 07/22/87 REDACTED .. . Ph.D.): REDACTED
REDACTED REDACTED

He was still doing considerable rationalizing and attributing a larger percentage of his behavior to wanting to help children than I was comfortable with. I pushed relatively hard for him to see that although much of his behavior may have been motivated by a desire to help other people, certainly a large portion of his behavior also needed to be viewed in terms of satisfying his own sexual needs. He reports that he does not become sexually stimulated, however, his masturbation fantasies revolve primarily around these experiences. Clearly, this is a sexual incident for him which is not to say that he does not have genuine fondness for some of the boys and that there are not altruistic impulses and altruistic aspects to his behavior. REDACTED
REDACTED

Reverend Michael Wempe


(5)

REDACTED

Sincerely,
REDACTED

REDACTED

I have read the above report and approve of its being mailed. I so signify my consent by my signature below.



This information has been disclosed to you from records. Confidentiality is protected by Federal Privacy Regulation (42 CFR, Part 2) prohibiting you from making any further disclosure of it without the specific written consent of the person to whom it pertains, or as otherwise permitted by such regulations. A general authorization for the release of medical or other information is NOT sufficient for this purpose.

1926

REFERRAL MEMORANDUM FROM ARCHBISHOP ROGER MAHONY

Date 8-21-87TO: Msgr. Cunningham

- () Please review, then SEE me
- () Please review, then RETURN to me
- () Please review, then SEND me your COMMENTS
- (X) Please review, then FILE


- () Please handle this matter entirely
- () Please answer; send copy of letter to me
- () Please write a reply for my signature
- () For your information

- () Please XEROX and send copy/copies to: _____

- () original to file
- () original back to me

REMARKS: Work needs to be done.Thank!

1921



Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025 (505) 829-3586
September 25, 1987

Most Reverend Roger Mahony, D.D.
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony:

Here is the second report on Reverend Michael Wempe who is currently in the program at Foundation House.

REDACTED



Reverend Michael Wempe

(6)

REDACTED

He also talked about other relationships. One of the more telling points was the statement he made about one boy that he did a lot of things together with. What he said was that he loved that boy too much to ever do anything sexual with him. There seemed to be some relationship in strength of the attachment that he felt toward a boy and his unwillingness to become sexually involved with that boy. It was extremely painful for him to go into such detail about his sexuality. He talked about the tremendous amount of trust that went into

Reverend Michael Wempe

(7)

his decision to share all this and left the session extremely upset REDACTED
REDACTED

REDACTED


X

Reverend Michael Wempe

(11)

REDACTED

Sincerely,



(Rev.) William D. Perri, s.P., M.A., D.Min.
Director: Foundation House

WDP:ss

I have read the above report and approve of its being mailed. I so signify my consent by my signature below.



This information has been disclosed to you from records whose confidentiality is protected by Federal Law. Federal Regulation (42 CFR, Part 2) prohibits you from making any further disclosure of it without the specific written consent of the person to whom it pertains, or as otherwise provided by such regulations. A general authorization for the release of medical or other information is NOT sufficient for this purpose.



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 1531 WEST NINTH STREET
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
 (213) 251-3200

COPY

REDACTED

(213) 251-3284

October 30, 1987

Rev. Michael Wempe
 Servants of the Paraclete
 Jemez Springs
 New Mexico 87025

Dear Mike:

I am planning to visit Jemez Springs in November--to arrive there on Wednesday, November 18, around 5-6 P.M.

If it would be convenient for you, I would be most happy to bring you to dinner that evening. Dr. REDACTED will set up some meetings on Thursday, and I will return to Los Angeles Thursday evening.

REDACTED is currently planning to visit there beginning the evening of Thursday, November 19.

I look forward very much to seeing you. Meantime, if you would like to talk to me ahead of time, please do not hesitate to call. My home number is REDACTED .

Faternally yours,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
 Vicar for Clergy

REDACTED

1909



Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025 (505) 829-3586
October 30, 1987

Most Reverend Roger Mahony, D.D.
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony:

Here is the third report on Reverend Michael Wempe who is currently in the program at Foundation House.

REDACTED



Reverend Michael Wempe

(3)

REDACTED

PSYCHOLOGICAL 09/30/87 REDACTED
REDACTED
REDACTED

Ph.D.): REDACTED

We talked about rationalization and how he has rationalized the hurt that he has done to kids. He initially took the stance that he could not see how he had hurt kids and my stance with him was essentially that everyone knows that one does not do sexual things with kids and that if he would show a video tape to anyone about what he did that they would identify it as sexual and they would identify that as wrong. REDACTED

REDACTED

Reverend Michael Wempe

(6)

REDACTED

REDACTED

Mike discussed the fact that he, in the times since our last meeting, has realized quite a number of things about himself that he had not realized before. He reports that he listened very carefully to the feedback that I was giving him and has now made contact with the parts of himself that he realizes that some of the things that he did with the kids were wrong and that they are his responsibility. REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

I suggested that he may want to start considering what sorts of restrictions he could live with if he were to return to active ministry and that it might be better off for him if he were to make up a list of his own restrictions before the restrictions were imposed on him. This would be an opportunity to have some say so in how that process turned out.

REDACTED

Reverend Michael Wempe
REDACTED

(7)

Sincerely,

Liam Hoare, s.P. M.A.

(Very Rev.) Wm. (Liam) Hoare, s.P., M.A.
Director: Foundation House

LH:ss

I have read the above report and approve of its being mailed. I so signify my consent by my signature below.

Michael E. Wempe

This information has been disclosed to you from records whose confidentiality is protected by Federal Law. Federal Regulation (42 CFR, Part 2) prohibits you from making any further disclosure of it without the specific written consent of the person to whom it pertains, or as otherwise permitted by such regulations. A general authorization for the release of medical or other information is NOT sufficient for this purpose.

1905

MEMORANDUMNovember 22, 1987

To: Archbishop Mahony

From: Msgr. Thomas Curry

Re: Father Michael Wempe

I met with Mike, Father Liam Hoare, the new Director of Foundation House, Dr. REDACTED, Mike's therapist, and REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED Dr. REDACTED reported that, while Mike has had a great deal of difficulty with the Program, he has made very significant progress in the last three weeks. My experience of the meeting together with the attached indicate this is true.

We spend a considerable amount of time discussing the confidentiality of the reports on Mike. At the beginning I stated I felt bound to share the attached with you despite his wish to have it destroyed immediately. He did not ask if I had seen the previous reports, and I did not indicate that I had. Neither did he ask if they had been destroyed. He is afraid the records will be sought by the courts at some time and that they could convict him. I stressed that, from a personnel point of view, the records constituted a protection and that, for future consideration of his case, the absence of records showing his response to therapy would be a hindrance.

We discussed the possibility of legal problems in the future. He is very aware that what he did comes within the scope of the criminal law in California. Although I do not know the exact details, he told me that there was some sexual touching, although most of his activity would better be described as "cuddling." He also mentioned that, with the exception of one boy, all the others involved are now over twenty-one. I encouraged him to contact a criminal lawyer to get a more exact evaluation of his legal status. Indeed, it is surprising the counselor he attended in California did not report him, and we agreed it would be better if Mike did not return to him.

Both Mike and Dr. REDACTED agreed on the absolute necessity of his continuing in counseling. This presents us with a problem, but Mike is so aware of this need that he would be willing to go to a diocese in another state--something he would not have been willing to consider earlier in the Program.

We discussed the possibility of his consulting a lawyer who would refer him to therapy, thus putting the reports under the protection of privilege or of finding a lawyer who is also a psychiatrist. I will investigate both possibilities.

With regard to future placement, Mike presents a greater challenge than REDACTED Dr. REDACTED discouraged campus ministry for the reason that minors

or students over eighteen but who are emotionally unformed attend college. Mike agreed with this assessment. On hospital ministry, the staff disagreed. Dr. REDACTED felt this would be suitable in that it involves a transient population, and Mike tends to get into trouble with long-term relationships. Father Hoare disagreed in that hospital ministry can involve minors and can provide for a good deal of physical touching with people in all stages of consciousness. I tend to agree with Dr. REDACTED in this case but asked them to continue to discuss this matter. We agreed that Adult Education and Engaged Encounter would be suitable activities. In general, I will look for areas of ministry where we are not able to provide a priest because of the shortage of clergy.

In addition to the parishes listed, Mike mentioned Corpus Christi, Pacific Palisades as he gets on very well with REDACTED. He is most attached to his dog, and I warned him this might limit his options. I will be in continued contact as he prepares to return.

TOM:

ENCLOSED PLEASE FIND A SUMMARY OF MY INPUT FOR OUR
PLACEMENT MEETING. I HAVE DOUBLED SPACED IT SO THAT YOU
CAN MAKE NOTES BEFORE OR DURING THE CONFERENCE.

THANKS,
MIKE

PLACEMENT

(Rev Michael Mempe)

I. Perspective:

A. MY main reasons for being here at Foundation House were to deal with issues of sexuality and relationship with authority.

B. Without minimizing either issue, it seems that both are symptoms of a deeper issue of MY neediness. I have very deep felt needs for which I did not take responsibility. I felt it was the responsibility of others to fulfill those needs and thus make me happy.

I needed intimacy and tried to use others, including the boys, to fulfill that need. I told myself that I was standing in for the boys fathers who were either absent or non-effective. I am now aware that I was manipulating the boys for MY own needs which manifested themselves sexually.

It was also lack of MY own Personal responsibility for MY own life, that led me to expect authority to always make me happy and fulfill MY needs. If authority did fulfill those needs, all went well. If they did not, I found areas for conflict.

MY time here at Foundation House has been most helpful in getting in touch with the areas of concern and Pain both for MYself and the Archdiocese. I and the staff are aware, however, that the healing process is not complete. Continued counselling is obviously indicated.

II. MY Goals:

A. Personal:

Personal integrity, which for me means continued counselling, so that I can take adult responsibility for the management of MY deepest needs including intimacy and relationship with authority.

B. Professional

A Return to fruitful ministry in the Church. I am aware that this will most likely mean specialized ministry for a time, but I would hope to return to Parish work in the future.

III. Concerns

A. Diocesan Concerns:

1. A Period of limited and specialized ministry, which should have specific restrictions about youth, both for my sake and that of the Diocese.
2. Due to the nature of the situation it might be best not to assign me to areas of Past concern, such as the high desert and Parts of Ventura County.

B. My Concerns:

1. Confidentiality - Reports from here destroyed, even this Paper - Personnel board, supervisor.
2. Continued counselling - necessary - legal Problems?
3. Spiritual Director REDACTED
4. Support groups - rectory support, maybe men who have been at this Program (Possible to arrange?), and REDACTED
5. Arrangements to keep dog.
6. Fear of Black neighborhoods.

IV. Talents and Qualifications

A. Vocational

Good Preacher, confessor and teacher.

B. Intellectual

Intelligent, a good writer, a fast typist.

1895

C. Educational

M.A. from St. Johns; almost M.S. from Mt. St. Mary's (M.,F., and C.C.)

D. Physical

Good athlete (golf, tennis, basketball)

V. Thoughts on areas of immediate ministry (with no Youth involvement)

A. Retreat work

Parish evening retreats, missions, Marriage, Engaged Encounters, Cursillo.

B. Propagation of Faith

C. Newman Chaplaincy

D. Areas where Priest needed but one not available in Past.

Personnel, fund raising, continuing ed.

E. Office work

F. Hospital work

VI. Long Term Ministry

A. Parish Ministry

B. Catholic Charities - Finish M.S. at Mt St. Mary's with view toward counselling of divorcing or marriage counselling. This counselling is not immediately recommended by staff.

VII. Random thoughts on residence - Possible in-built support

A. REDACTED - close to my REDACTED

B. REDACTED - Past residence with him.

C. REDACTED - comfortable with him and trust him.



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
(213) 251-3284

December 10, 1987

Rev. Michael Wempe
REDACTED

Dear Mike:

Recently I was referred to a Dr. REDACTED
a psychiatrist who practices in REDACTED He is
very experienced in counseling priests and conducts a
priests' support group in San Bernardino.

He would be open to coming to Los Angeles for the same
purpose, and since the aftercare program at Cherry
Valley does not seem to be operative, I would very much
like to get such a group into operation here.

Could you give me a call at your convenience and let
me know your thoughts on this?

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

1890



Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025 (505) 829-3586

December 23, 1987

Most Reverend Roger Mahony, D.D.
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

With the conclusion of the Foundation House Program, I would like to apprise you of my final recommendations relative to Fr. Michael Wempe. These are based on an overview and have been made in consultation with Staff observations. If there are any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

REDACTED

3) Future ministry - for the time being, he needs to be in a situation which will allow him to avoid all contact with minors and also help him stay away from the opportunity for forming manipulative relationships with people who are relatively vulnerable. This does not only apply to minors and is not only a sexual matter, but fits into a pattern that Mike has been involved in various points in his life.

4) Conditions as set out in the meeting with Monsignor Tom Curry such as: no physical contact with minors except to shake hands, never being alone with minors, etc.


REDACTED



Our sincerest thanks for your confidence in our program. We stand ready to be of any possible assistance in the future. Prayerful best wishes for a blessed Christmas Season and a Happy New Year.

Sincerely for Christ and His priests,

Liam Hoare, S.P.
(Very Rev.) Liam J. Hoare, S.P., M.A., C.A.C.
Director of Foundation Hous



Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025 (505) 829-3586
December 23, 1987

Most Reverend Roger Mahony, D.D.
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony:

Here is the final report on Reverend Michael Wempe who is currently in the program at Foundation House.

REDACTED

Mike had been the focus last week during my absence, and we also spent a good deal of time hearing from him again today. He said that he had had a real breakthrough in terms of how he viewed himself and his sexual behavior with minors and now feels evidently that he is able to take responsibility and recognize the potential for harm in his behavior. He certainly had never felt that as much of a possibility before. REDACTED

REDACTED



Reverend Michael Wempe
REDACTED

(2)

Reverend Michael Wempe

(3)

REDACTED

My agenda for today was to present him with the necessity to give the diocese the opportunity to ask any questions about specifics in terms of his sexual involvements that they have the need to ask. I proposed to him that I call the personnel director to let him know that he will have the opportunity to ask any questions that he may have, to let him know that even though there has been no mention nor threat, no indication whatsoever of a lawsuit that there are some potential lawsuits out there so that they can be prepared to ask whatever questions they choose to ask or choose not to ask. Mike was agreeable to this. It was clearly not his first choice but he was willing to go along with, which I see as a real step for Mike and considerably more flexibility than he has displayed thus far. The plan then is to contact the diocese and offer them this opportunity when they come out here for the meeting.

REDACTED

December 3, 1987

I, Michael E. Wilson, am giving my permission for this final report to be sent. I have read it, except for the recommendations Fr. REDACTED REDACTED has added after my departure from the Foundation House program, and I approve of its being mailed.

Michael E. Wilson
SIGNATURE

REDACTED

12-2-87

DATE SIGNED

This information has been disclosed to you from records whose confidentiality is protected by Federal Law. Federal Regulation (42 CFR Part 2) prohibits you from making any further disclosure of it without the specific written consent of the person to whom it pertains, or as otherwise permitted by such regulations. A general authorization for the release of medical or other information is NOT sufficient for this purpose.

Feb. 5, 1988

Padre,

Much thanks for spending the evening with
and I yesterday REDACTED

Numerous, diverse thoughts have gone through my head
since then; most profound, painful, and obvious of them
is the thought/feeling that came to me as
began to explain the whole situation That is, that
this silence over years and years, due to selfishness
and the will to survive, served only to protect this
man in the ugly things he was doing. I only wish
now that I'd've passed this info along to you
(or whomever) long ago, so that more could have been
done sooner. Somehow I felt, I guess, that my
information would effect no change, that I was powerless.

Nevertheless, here we are today, and I appreciate your
friendship. Let's have that dinner (and movie?) someday
soon in Lima or Gordale. Pick a day in March, and
let us know. Peace to you! REDACTED

254828

Feb. 5, 1988

Padre,

Much thanks for spending the evening with
and I yesterday

Numerous, diverse thoughts have gone through my head
since then; most profound, painful, and obvious of them
is the thought/feeling that came to me as
began to explain the whole situation That is, that
this silence over years and years, due to selfishness
and the will to survive, served only to protect this
man in the ugly things he was doing. I only wish
now that I'd've passed this info along to you
(or whomever) long ago, so that more could have been
done sooner. Somehow I felt, I guess, that my
information would affect no change, that I was powerless.

Nevertheless, here we are today, and I appreciate your
friendship. Let's have that dinner (and movie?) someday
soon in Lima or Glendale. Pick a day in March, and
let us know. Peace to you!



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 Santa Barbara Pastoral Region
 3240 Calle Pinon
 Santa Barbara, California 93105
 805-682-0442

REDACTED

February 8, 1988

Dear Tom,

As per your request that I put in writing the revelations made to me recently about FR. MIKE WEMPE, I am jotting down these notes.

Last week, two young men, REDACTED and REDACTED had dinner with me at their request and revealed their facts and feelings. Both men are in their twenty's, REDACTED is REDACTED and REDACTED is looking forward to being so. They seem to have "weathered the storm" of their experience with Mike fairly well.

They indicated that when they were in their teenage years, young teens, Mike had several times molested them in his camper while on outing with them. REDACTED finally confronted Mike with this, even kicked him out of the bed once, which Mike had persuaded him to sleep in for lack of bed space, and finally totally broke off any communication with Mike. REDACTED also spoke of his experiences, similar to REDACTED.

I know the family well. REDACTED was in the seminary at OLQA during my tenure there and we are very good friends. Their veracity is very strong in my view.

I have enclosed a letter I received yesterday from REDACTED giving more of his feelings, since during our dinner-talk REDACTED did most of the talking.

I ask you to keep this confidential to the extent that you can. I was unaware of this matter until recently, though there were occasional "rumors" of something like this.

Sincerely yours in Christ.
 REDACTED



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 Santa Barbara Pastoral Region
 3240 Calle Pinon
 Santa Barbara, California 93105
 805-682-0442

REDACTED

February 8, 1988

Dear REDACTED

As per your request that I put in writing the revelations made to me recently about FR. MIKE WEMPE, I am jotting down these notes.

Last week, two young men, REDACTED had dinner with me at their request and revealed their facts and feelings. Both men are in their twenty's, REDACTED is REDACTED, and REDACTED is looking forward to being so. They seem to have "weathered the storm" of their experience with Mike fairly well.

They indicated that when they were in their teenage years, young teens, Mike had several times molested them in his camper while on outing with them. REDACTED finally confronted Mike with this, even kicked him out of the bed once, which Mike had persuaded him to sleep in for lack of bed space, and finally totally broke off any communication with Mike. REDACTED also spoke of his experiences, similar to REDACTED.

I know the family well. REDACTED was in the seminary at OLQA during my tenure there and we are very good friends. Their veracity is very strong in my view.

I have enclosed a letter I received yesterday from REDACTED, giving more of his feelings, since during our dinner-talk REDACTED did most of the talking.

I ask you to keep this confidential to the extent that you can. I was unaware of this matter until recently, though there were occasional "rumors" of something like this.

REDACTED

254827

REFERRAL MEMORANDUM FROM ARCHBISHOP ROGER MAHONY

Date: 2-20-88TO: Msgr. Curry

- (X) Please review, then SEE me
() Please review, then RETURN to me
() Please review, then SEND me your COMMENTS
() Please review, then FILE
- () Please handle this matter entirely
() Please answer; send copy of letter to me
() Please write a reply for my signature
() For your information
- () Please XEROX and send copy/copies to: _____

- () original to file
() original back to me

REMARKS: _____

Thanks!

1875

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 14, 1988
FROM: Monsignor Curry
TO: File
RE: Michael Wempe

REDACTED - (REDACTED) REDACTED

Had spoken to REDACTED. He was in the Junior Seminary about REDACTED years ago and was abused by Mike Wempe. who was a family friend. His mother was the only one who knew about it and was and has been terribly upset about it. I told him the Archdiocese would pay for counseling, and he and his mother may go.

He asked me if I would have any objection to his confronting Mike Wempe, and I said no. He did not want me to talk to him in advance.

I explained that he had been through major treatment, and that he had responded well. Also, I explained he was in a controlled situation whereby he would not be in ministry to minors.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 26, 1988
FROM: Monsignor Curry
TO: Archbishop Mahony
RE: Meeting with REDACTED ACTED


I had a long and very productive meeting with REDACTED yesterday. He meets on a monthly basis with six of our priests who have been in therapy at Jemez Springs. He appears to be getting along very well with them, and I have heard good reports from them about him. The following are some short comments on each of the priests:

✓ Mike Wempe: Mike is making good progress, but he very much needs this therapy. He is most aware of his problems, but his difficulty is finding the emotional resources to control them. Of all the priests, Mike is the one Dr. REDACTED would see as being in most danger of getting in trouble again.

1874

Thanks for the update!
+ RMM

4-27-88



Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025 (505) 829-3586

June 30, 1988

THE MOST REVEREND ROGER MAHONY, D.D.
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
LOS ANGELES, CA 90015

Your Excellency,

The Director of Foundation House, The Very Reverend Liam J. Hoare, S.P., in his capacity as Servant General of the Servants of the Paraclete, is presently conducting Visitation of the English Houses of the Community. On his behalf, I would like to express our gratitude for allowing FATHER MICHAEL WEMPE to take part in the AFTERCARE/FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the Reports of each of the Therapists. I feel that they are rather self-evident and speak to the issues in question. Fr. Liam met with each man personally and will be available for any further inquiries as of July 11th.

Once more, we ask you to PLEASE DESTROY THESE PAGES AND ANY OTHER MATERIAL YOU HAVE RECEIVED FROM US. This is stated for your own and our legal protection.


Again, our thanks for your interest and consideration, and for allowing us a part in the recovery process. The men in attendance expressed their satisfaction, and we feel that the renewed contact with fellow members is a needed source of evaluation and encouragement. Wishing you all the best for the summer, with kind and prayerful regards, I remain

Sincerely for Christ and His priests,

Neil R. Saller, T.O.R.

(Rev.) Neil R. Saller, T.O.R., J.U.L.
Director of Villa Louis Martin
Acting-Director of Foundation House

1870



REDACTED

REDACTED

He's very caught up in the work at the hospital, derives enjoyment and self-satisfaction from that experience and feels like he really is beginning to settle in. We talked some about the possibility of a C.P.E. program. I can see some real advantages to his taking a C.P.E. program to give him a little more security in what he is doing and a little more knowledge for implementing some of the things that he would like to take care of there. If this is something that he decides that he wants to do, it would certainly be my recommendation that he provided with that opportunity. Mike continues to do very well, has a good support system, is seeing lots of people, developing friendships, and taking care of his needs through these interactions with adults. I am most optimistic about the prospects for Mike.

REDACTED



RELEASE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

To: The Professional Staffs of: Foundation House
 Servants of the Paraclete
 Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025
 (505) 829-3586

Sma.
B. 72

I hereby authorize you to provide:

Archbishop Roger Mahony

1531 W. 9th St.

L.A., Cal 90015

with a complete report of my Follow-up Workshop Week spent with the Servants of the Paraclete. The recipients of this material are also duly notified that once these documents have been read, THEY ARE TO BE DESTROYED OR RETURNED TO FR. LIAM HOARE, S.P., WHO WILL SEE TO THEIR DISPOSAL. This policy is mandated by present legal advisement and for the protection of the Individual, Bishop/Superior, Dioceses/Community, and our own Program.

Michael E. Wense
 (Signature)

REDACTED

(Signature of witness)

6-8-88
 (Date)

Michael Wempe December 27, 1988

Mike came to see me today. I told him that REDACTED had been in touch with me and that he had received counseling. I also told Mike the Archdiocese would send him the bill for the counseling. He was concerned about possible legal action, and I told him there were no indications that would happen.

I brought up his drinking--that it seemed strange in view of his health problems and that given the other circumstances of his life, drinking could be a grave problem. Asked him to go see REDACTED and he agreed to do so.

He asked about the possibility of his going back to a parish. I asked him what the young men we discussed would do about that, and he was not aware they would be a problem. I explained that he would have to build up a track record before the question could even be considered. REDACTED
REDACTED

Mike Wempe: Mike will be considerably more difficult to place. His progress appears much more modest than REDACTED. May I call your attention to Dr. REDACTED comments beginning on page ten of the attached report. I will be most interested in the Program's assessment of him. Given his past, I don't think we can assign him to parish ministry, and there are no clear alternative options at the moment.

The recent personnel changes do not appear to have disrupted the program there. However, their aftercare program seems to me to be in disarray.

Michael Wempe December 30, 1988

Spoke to Dr. REDACTED today. Mike is working very hard, but his progress is relatively show. Dr. REDACTED works towards a change in the structure of one's life. Mike's problems are very deep rooted and so his progress is slow. His style is primitive, and he was stunted in the early stages of growth. He is not out of danger, REDACTED
REDACTED They have an agreement that he will limit his drinking to two drinks a day, and Mike seems to be keeping to that agreement. He is working very hard and doing better in the group.



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
(213) 251-3284

January 6, 1989

Rev. Michael Wempe
St. Ambrose Church
1281 Fairfax Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Dear Mike:

Many thanks for coming to see me last week. In the course of our conversation, I mentioned that REDACTED had called me earlier in the year about a problem he had with you some time ago. I suggested he go to therapy and gave him the name of a therapist. Subsequently, the Archdiocese received and paid the enclosed bills.

In matters of sexual misconduct or other problems involving clergy, the Archdiocese is firm in maintaining that it is the responsibility of the priest involved to assist the injured party. Therefore, in instances such as this, we ask that the priest be responsible for the cost of the therapy. For this reason I am forwarding the enclosed bills to you and asking that you reimburse the Archdiocese in the amount of \$490.

The last bill was for June 28, 1988 so I assume therapy is not continuing. If there are further requests for assistance, I will be sure to contact you about them.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have need for further information.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

mk

Enclosure

cc: Archbishop Mahony

1867

SAINT AMBROSE church

1281 North Fairfax Avenue • Hollywood, California 90046

18 January 1989

Fr. REDACTED
REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

Last night Fr. Mike Wempe came in to discuss with me a comment I had made to Msgr. Tom Curry about him. In our recent telephone conversation I had given you permission to quote me to Mike on that comment.

I am very upset that Mike was given the impression that comments I made were in the form of a letter, rather than in casual conversation with Tom. It is exactly this kind of miscommunication and carelessness which can ruin the relationship and trust between priests - especially between those who live in the same house.

I must say that it has only been Mike's maturity and willingness to discuss the situation which has saved me much heartache and anxiety.

I thought you should know.

Sincerely Yours.
REDACTED

cc Fr. Mike Wempe
Msgr. Tom Curry



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
REDACTED

February 17, 1989

Rev. Michael Wempe
St. Ambrose Church
1281 Fairfax Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Dear Mike:

Many thanks for our meeting on Wednesday last, and for the very frank and candid exchange there..

As I stated, your good health is of paramount importance both to you and to the Archdiocese. This situation arose out of a concern with your drinking, and again I want to reiterate how potentially dangerous the consumption of alcohol is for you, and that a degree of consumption that for another person might pass unnoticed can have grave consequences for you.

I do not wish you to feel spied upon, but we all do have to continue to monitor your appointment. In this, Father REDACTED REDACTED as pastor of the parish, is in a somewhat unusual position, and I did not want him to be unduly pressured. Let me hasten to add that I understood REDACTED to say he did not feel any such pressure.

As we proceed, I hope we can continue to focus on the positive, that you are performing a valuable and productive ministry.

Please be assured of my continued support and eagerness to assist you.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

cc: REDACTED

Archbishop Roger Mahony ✓

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 17, 1989
FROM: Monsignor Curry
TO: Archbishop Mahony
RE: Mike Wempe

REDACTED Mike, and I met last Wednesday in response to the attached letter from REDACTED. Earlier, REDACTED had mentioned to me a concern about Mike's drinking, and I had asked REDACTED to follow up on it.

My concern, which I made clear to all, was that the central issue had to be the issue of drinking, and not how Mike's rights were violated or whether REDACTED had spoken or written a letter to me.

In my conversations with REDACTED about the priests who see him, he seems least sure of Mike, in that Mike has a great way to go in understanding responsibility, gaining true maturity, etc., and does need to be monitored.

*Please continue to monitor the
situation closely.*

+ RMM

2-17-89

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 15, 1989
FROM: Monsignor Thomas Curry
TO: Archbishop Mahony
RE: Progress Report from Dr. REDACTED

CONFIDENTIAL

Dr. REDACTED called me today to say that, because of the progress made by several members of the group of priests he was meeting with, they have agreed with him that the group meeting is no longer necessary, but he will continue to see them individually.

✓ Mike Wempe: Mike is doing very well and does not need to continue to see REDACTED except as he feels the need to do so.

*Let's discuss these
in person -*

+ RMM

9-19-89

1855



Frederick Wempe

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of
Vicar for Clergy
(213) 251-3284

1531
West Ninth
Street

Los Angeles
California
90015-1194

September 1, 1994

Rev. Michael E. Wempe
St. Ambrose Church
1281 Fairfax Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90046-4433

Dear Mike:

I must begin this letter with an apology. I have been remiss in not sending you information regarding your group therapy with REDACTED

As I am sure you know by now, the Los Angeles Times published a notice early this summer regarding REDACTED involvement in a professional matter that resulted in a review of his conduct by an investigatory Board. At that time, I was not sure whether the matter involved a revocation of his license or a period of probation that would have restricted his practice of therapy.

I am sorry for not having written promptly to tell you at least that much, so that you would understand that his relationship with you and with the Archdiocese was under review.

Since then, our Legal Department has been studying the matter, and REDACTED himself made available to me just last week all the material from the Board of Review that dealt with a matter of misconduct with one of his patients a number of years ago. Having now read that material, I am prepared to meet with him soon to consider the advisability of his continuing in his previous relationship with you and other priests of the Archdiocese.

I can tell you that REDACTED has been most cooperative in disclosing the matter involved, and once I have talked it over with him I will be in touch with you for input before making a final decision. You can expect a letter or phone call from me within one month, so that we can resolve this matter, which has caused disruption to you, as well as confusion, I am sure, as regards your relations with him.

With thanks for your patience, I remain

Yours in Christ,

1854

(Rev. Msgr.) Timothy J. Dyer
Vicar for Clergy

Pastoral Regions: Our Lady of the Angels San Fernando San Gabriel San Pedro Santa Barbara

CLERGY DATABASE

Last:Wempe

Title:Rev.

First: Michael

Middle:E.

Color **Green**

02/08/88 Excerpts from REDACTED letter to REDACTED He had
 dinner with two young men REDACTED and REDACTED . They told REDACTED that
 Fr. had several times molested them in his camper while on outing with them. REDACTED
 was in the Jr. Seminary when he was abused by Fr. who was a family friend. He
 went to therapy with REDACTED 01/18/88 He was appointed Chaplain at
 Mount Sinai Hospital. 09/11/96 -- Cell phone REDACTED In addition to the
 car which the hospital has assigned to him, Lic. No. REDACTED he also drives a
 truck (REDACTED and REDACTED car, REDACTED

Feb 15 02 11:40a

MICHAEL E. WEMPE

REDACTED

p.2



CEDARS-SINAI MEDICAL CENTER.

REV. MICHAEL WEMPE, M.A., S.T.B.
CATHOLIC CHAPLAIN

February 15, 2002

REDACTED

CEO

CEDARS - SINAI MEDICAL CENTER

Re: Retirement

Dear Tom:

14 years ago I arrived at Cedars - Sinai to begin a new phase of my priestly life. I remember feelings of hope, joy, fear and a sense of unworthiness. All but two of these feelings disappeared very quickly, they being fear and unworthiness. I feared I might not be capable of touching the hearts and especially the souls of my patients who were in such need, and knew that God could have chosen a number of priests better suited to the task at hand

During my years here at the medical center I have found so much love, respect and support and began to wonder what life would be without the Medical Center. Today, I begin to find out. A whole series of circumstances bring my about my resignation:

- There is a standing Archdiocesan Policy that all priests of the status of pastor or its equivalent are bound by term limits, namely 6 years with a possible 6 year renewal. I had hoped that had passed my by after 14 years, but Cardinal Mahoney, realizing the stress of daily ministration to the sick and my own personal health felt I had given more than my best to the Medical Center.
- I have been having a difficult time controlling my REDACTED Personal, patient and in-house stresses are taking their toll.
- REDACTED health is also deteriorating and she is needing more and more of my assistance. She is certainly not invalided, but is now on a cane and having some trouble with daily activities.

Cardinal Mahony and I met last Wednesday to discuss these issues and he felt that after 35 years service to the Archdiocese in many capacities it might be best for me to take retirement. I was stunned, yet I immediately felt a sense of relief. Yes, I too believe it is time to say "I have fought the good fight, I have run the good race."

Obviously I do this with so much love and thanks giving in my heart for Cedars - Sinai. May the Medical Center and I both be continually blest by God.

Respectfully submitted:

M. Wempe
Rev. Michael E. Wempe

CC: REDACTED REDACTED
REDACTED

8700 BEVERLY BOULEVARD, ROOM 2508, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90048-1565
TELEPHONE: (310) 423-5550 • FAX: (310) 423-0643 • E-MAIL: WEMPE@CSHS.ORG

1852

REVEREND MICHAEL E. WEMPE

Appointments

St. John Chrysostom, Inglewood - Associate 05/14/66
St. Andrew, Pasadena - Associate 03/25/69
St. Rose of Lima, Simi Valley - Associate 09/02/69
St. Jude, Westlake Village - Associate 06/11/73
Sacred Heart, Ventura - Associate 06/17/77
Paraclete High School, Lancaster - Faculty 02/20/78
St. Mary, Palmdale - Residence 02/20/78
St. Sebastian, Santa Paula - Associate 07/09/84
Sabbatical (Vatican II Institute) 09/86 - 12/86
St. Sebastian, Santa Paula - Administrator Pro-Tem 02/01/87
Sick Leave - 07/01/87
St. Ambrose, Los Angeles - Residence 01/18/88
Cedars-Sinai Hospital, Los Angeles - Chaplain 01/18/88 - 02/15/2002
Immaculate Heart of Mary, Los Angeles - Residence 10/15/98
Cathedral Chapel, Los Angeles - Residence 02/01/2002
Retired, living privately 02/15/2002

254814

CCI 003401



MEMORANDUM

TO: Cardinal Roger Mahony
 FROM: Monsignor Craig A. Cox
 RE: Request of Father Wempe
 DATE: 2 March 2002

CONFIDENTIAL

Father Wempe had previously agreed to do a wedding for some long time friends of his, currently scheduled on REDACTED at St. John Neumann Parish, Irvine.

He asked if he could do this wedding. He believes that if he were not to do it after having previously agreed to do so, it would draw comment and attention and questions.

Father Wempe stressed that he will not accept any similar invitations in the future.

As to my recommendation, I lean towards saying "yes" with the proviso that, in the unlikely and lamentable event of any press coverage naming him prior to the wedding, he would agree to back out.

My other concern is that fact that the site of the wedding is in the Diocese of Orange. Would we need to clear this with Bishop Brown first? I could call Monsignor Urell and explore the matter with him. Please advise.

Thank you.

a) please call John - get their OK - if they say no, I concur -

b) my preference: we make no exceptions.
 + Mike plan a trip out of state for those days - maybe a 3-day retreat in Arizona - + explain this to his friend.
 + Riker

REDACTED

March 7, 2002

Cardinal Roger Michael Mahony
Archdiocese Of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Ref: Rev. Michael Wimpe

Dear Cardinal Mahony,

I read with interest the Los Angeles Times article about the priests recently removed due to sexual misconduct with minors. I wanted to make sure the church was aware that that Rev. Michael Wimpe sexually abused me, and most likely other young/teenage boys during his time spent at St. Jude's Church in Westlake Village, and other parishes. Rev Wimpe molested me multiple times while he was located at St. Jude, another parish in Venture and while at the Catholic high school located in the Palmdale/Lancaster area.

My abuse happened while I was 14 to 16 years old (roughly 1976 to 1978). It would happen during weekend trips to the mountains where he had arranged to use for a weekend, a cabin, and in a vacation trailer. The abuse consisted of: fondling of genitals, oral sex, masturbation, and other sexual acts.

I have been in therapy for almost 10 years now, to deal with this and the problems resulting from his abuse and the environment at home, which enable him to be so successful. I should have written this letter many years ago to alert the church, and perhaps make more of a difference. The Sheriff's office of Los Angeles County has a report of this incident, since a therapist was required to report the crime.

I would like to see the church work actively to address these types of complaints. I believe that priests who commit crimes should be held fully accountable including going to jail. In addition, it is vitally important that work needs to be done by the church to address "sexuality issues" of priests and nuns (and lay-people in the church), prior to these people being allowed to work with kids.

You of course can throw this letter out and act as if nothing has happened. However, I would suspect I am not the first to come forward regarding this individual, since the last I had heard, he was placed at Cedar Sinai Medical Center. Clearly, placing a priest at a Jewish hospital, when you are short of them, is an admission of a problem being kept under-wraps.

REDACTED

I am continuing my therapy to re-claim what was damaged by my relationship with Rev. Wimpe. As a survivor, I will not allow the past to ruin my future; I work daily to make my marriage of almost 9 years better, and to be the loving and caring father to REDACTED that they deserve. I have not been to a church in many years, only for funerals and weddings. I continue to struggle with the concept of teaching religious values to my children. I am a person with strong moral values and good ethics, which I try and demonstrate in my life, whether at home or at work. I currently believe that my children will best be served by not having a formal religious education until they are old enough to determine who they are as a person, and what religion brings to their life.

This issue has caused a great deal of anxiety in my life, REDACTED, and continues to today. I am saddened when I read about the church's slow response in Boston. I hope that the statistics listed in the article are not representative of the general population of priest in the United States (10% of the area priests have been accused of sexual or child abuse). However, I fear this is an under-reported statistic due to the stigma often associated with sexual abuse. Only people in your position have the power to make changes, to stop the denial and make healthy changes for the people you serve.


I would like to ask of the church, what it intends to do to specifically address my abuse by Rev. Michael Wimpe. And what it intends to do to keep this from continuing in the future with other kids.

Sincerely,
REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

CERTIFIED MAIL





7001 2510 0002 7171 1777



Cardinal Roger Michael Mahony
 Archdiocese Of Los Angeles
 3424 Wishire Blvd
 Los Angeles, CA 90010

30010+2202 40



1849

Oct.
2004

Archdiocese of Los AngelesOffice of
Vicar for Clergy
(213) 637-72843424
Wilshire
BoulevardLos Angeles
California
90010-2241

March 12, 2002

Reverend Michael Wempe
REDACTED

Dear Mike:

I am glad I was able to chat with you briefly on the phone tonight. This letter is to put on paper the arrangements that have been made for your retirement. I hope that the release from the stresses of your ministry will enhance the quality of your health, and also enable you to better care for your mother in her old age.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$5,000 to assist you with transition expenses.

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED



COPY

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of
Vicar for Clergy
(213) 637-7284

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2241

March 27, 2002

REDACTED

Dear REDACTED

Cardinal Mahony has asked that I reply to your moving letter of March 7, 2002 that was post marked March 25. Thank you for writing. Let me first assure you that Father Michael Wempe is no longer in active ministry.

Your therapist was right to report the incidents you described to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. We are referring those who suffered abuse in the past to Detective Dale REDACTED of the Los Angeles Police Department. If you wish to make a report beyond that already submitted by your therapist, we encourage you to call Detective REDACTED REDACTED

Like you, we want to take all steps to protect others, especially children, from misconduct by any Church minister. To strive to prevent sexual misconduct, we recently finished a series of training sessions for priests and have additional ones scheduled for other ministers. The personal, psychological and background screening efforts introduced into the seminary in the last decade are extensive. Also, please find enclosed a copy of a brochure that was developed by our advisory board over the last several years that we are distributing to our parishes and other institutions.

If you were resident in the Los Angeles area, I would invite and encourage you to meet with two of our officials to tell your story so that we can obtain further information about your experiences with Father Wempe. Should you have occasion to be in Los Angeles in the near future, I would be happy to arrange this. If you will not be out here, yet wish to take advantage of an opportunity to tell your story to us more fully, I can also make arrangements through your local diocese to have them designate someone to meet with you. Please let me know if you wish to do this.

You asked how we might specifically address the abuse you experienced. We do have provisions to assist with the therapy needed by any person mistreated by priests or other Church ministers.

Should you wish to explore this possibility, please phone Sister REDACTED or REDACTED REDACTED at REDACTED


1845

-2-

Let me conclude by apologizing. No one, child or adult, should ever suffer victimization at the hands of a minister of the Church. While we cannot undo history, we can and are learning from it in order to make every effort to protect others in the future.

Thank you again for writing. May God bless you.

Sincerely yours,



Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
Vicar for Clergy

enclosure: *Respecting the Boundaries*

cc: REDACTED

1846

OFFICE OF THE VICAR FOR CLERGY

TO: REDACTED
FROM:
RE: *Reverend Michael Wempe*
DATE: March 29, 2002

Father Michael Wempe will be retiring before age 65 due to medical reasons.
REDACTED

Thank you for taking note of this information.



MEMORANDUM
OFFICE OF THE VICAR FOR CLERGY

TO: REDACTED

FROM:

RE: *Father Michael Wempe*

DATE: March 29, 2002

On February 15, 2002, Father Michael Wempe was granted early retirement due to medical reasons. He is sixty-two years old. He was born on REDACTED REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

3 April 2002

REDACTED

REDACTED

Archdiocesan Catholic Center
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90010-2241

RE: NOTICE OF LEGAL INTEREST IN FILES RE **MICHAEL WEMPE**

Dear REDACTED

This letter will inform you that I have been retained to represent the above-named individual in all respects concerning an investigation of misconduct alleged to have occurred while he was a Priest within the Los Angeles Archdiocese.

It is possible during the course of any such investigation that government agencies, attorneys, or other people will request access to any copies of files that may be in the possession, custody, or control of the Archdiocese respecting my client, his personnel records, or any record of any discipline, investigation, or proceeding the Archdiocese conducted relative to my client.

My client has important legal interests in any such files, derived from his various Constitutional rights. PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT HE OBJECTS TO THE RELEASE OF ANY INFORMATION THAT CONCERNS HIM OR ANY INVESTIGATION ABOUT HIM. So that his legal rights may be protected, please give me prompt notice of any request for such records, whether the request is informal, written or oral, or in the nature of a subpoena, discovery, or any other legal process. I will then be able to take appropriate legal action to enforce my client's many legal rights. Thank you for your assistance in this regard.

Very truly yours,

REDACTED

1842

REDACTED
REDACTED

April 4, 2002


Rev. Monsignor Craig A. Cox
The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90010-2241

Dear Monsignor Cox:

REDACTED

Sincerely,
REDACTED

Enclosure



Los Angeles Times

50¢ Designated Areas Higher

COPYRIGHT 2002/CC/144 PAGES

SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 2002

Mahony Regrets Transfer of Priest

By BETH SHUSTER
and RICHARD WINTON
TIMES STAFF WRITERS

Cardinal Roger M. Mahony said Friday he erred when he transferred a priest accused of molesting children to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center about 14 years ago without telling hospital officials about the allegations.

In his first public comments on a sex abuse case involving the Los Angeles Archdiocese, Mahony said he never should have assigned Father Michael Wempe to Cedars-Sinai without informing hospital officials that he had removed Wempe from his parish and ordered him to a New Mexico treatment facility for evaluation and counseling.

After the treatment, Mahony said, he was told Wempe could be trusted to work as a priest if he were in a supervised job without access to children. Mahony said he was told Wempe could serve in a prison or a hospital.

When he assigned Wempe to Cedars-Sinai, Mahony said, he did not know it had a pediatric unit.

"I think that was a mistake on our part then to not simply tell them of his background," Mahony told The Times. "That should have been done. I take responsibility for that."

In retrospect, Mahony said, he should have forced Wempe to immediately resign after hearing of the abuse allegations. "Fourteen years [later] is so different," said Mahony, who has headed the L.A. Archdiocese since 1985. "If that had been today, he would have been removed."

Please see **MAHONY, A19**

RELATED STORY

Law won't quit: In a letter to priests, the cardinal makes it clear he'll stay on the job. **A14**

MAHONY: Cardinal Now Regrets Transfer of Priest

Continued from A1

have been out of the priesthood."

Mahony said he did not report Wempe's abuse allegations to police at the time. He assigned Wempe to Cedars-Sinai, where he worked from 1988 until last month, when Mahony forced him to retire under his recent "zero tolerance" policy against maintaining abusers in the church.

Mahony said he recently gave Wempe's name to the Los Angeles Police Department to review past allegations against him.

Wempe, 62, could not be reached for comment Friday. He had been living at a church parish attached to a school south of Hancock Park, according to a parish directory and interviews, but has since moved to Seal Beach.

Cedars-Sinai officials said they learned Friday about past allegations against Wempe. Grace Cheng, spokeswoman for Cedars-Sinai, said officials contacted the archdiocese earlier this week after inquiries from The Times. Representatives of the archdiocese met Friday with top officials of Cedars-Sinai.

"There were absolutely no complaints or claims or any issues of impropriety or misconduct" while Wempe was at the hospital, Cheng said.

Hospital officials described Wempe as well-liked. Mahony said he attended a luncheon in the chaplain's honor a couple of years ago. A retirement party scheduled for this month was canceled at Wempe's request, officials said.

"To the best of our knowledge . . . this particular priest was functioning very well and effectively," Mahony said. "As far as we know, there was never a hint" of any impropriety at the hospital.

On Wednesday, two brothers, now grown, filed a lawsuit in Orange County Superior Court alleging they had been sexually abused by Wempe from about 1976 to 1985. The suit also names the archdiocese, alleging that senior priests knew—or should have known—of Wempe's misconduct but failed to intervene.

Brothers Say Transfers Didn't Stop the Abuse

In an interview Friday with their attorney present, Mark and Lee Bashforth, who asked that their names be published, said the abuse began in a Ventura County parish and continued as Wempe was transferred to other area churches. Both men said they only recently remembered the abuse.

"I was 8 or 9 years old and I am staying in the rectory in his room overnight, where there is only one bed," said Lee Bashforth, 32.

Archdiocese officials had not seen the lawsuit and would not comment Friday.

Mahony said he believed a therapist Wempe saw in 1987 reported the case to authorities, but the cardinal was not certain. A source with knowledge of the case said allegations about Wempe were reported to the archdiocese in 1987 or 1988.

The Los Angeles Archdiocese is among a number of Roman Catholic ministries enmeshed in the widening sex abuse scandal. Recent and decades-old accusations of abuse by priests and others affiliated with the church began draw-

memory, the mind does not let you recall these things," Mark Bashforth said. "[Wempe] gave a blessing in Lee's wedding ceremony. He did that knowing what he had done to my brother. How could he carry on this charade?"

R. Richard Farnell, a Newport Beach attorney representing the brothers, said Wempe had a history of abuse that was ignored by the archdiocese.

"The church concealed the truth about this priest for decades, moving him from parish to parish, without any thought for the children," Farnell said. "There are going to be other victims out there. A pedophile does not just do this once."



Archdiocese of Los Angeles 2002 Catholic Directory

Father Michael Wempe, seen in 1966 photo, was ordered to a treatment center in the 1980s.

ing national attention after highly-publicized cases in Boston earlier this year.

The Times reported in March that six to 12 priests had been dismissed by Mahony in February for past sexual abuse of minors. Mahony, under growing pressure to reveal details about the cases, would say only that "a few" priests, almost all of them retired, were involved.

On Friday, Mahony continued to refuse to name priests accused of sexual abuse, repeating earlier statements that he has been asked by two victims not to divulge the priests' names.

For the first time, however, Mahony clarified the number of known sex abuse cases. He said seven cases allegedly occurred before 1997, four in the last five years and another four were connected to priests who have since left the ministry and cannot be found. There were also a smaller group of allegedly abusive priests who are now dead, Mahony said.

In a 90-minute interview, conducted Friday afternoon in the residence receiving room of the new downtown cathedral, Mahony said the cases "gnaw" at him. He said he has trouble sleeping when he thinks about the victims.

"I keep reaffirming my own pledge to do everything in my power to make sure no one is harmed by the church," Mahony said. "That's what keeps me up at night: real sadness, sorrow, devastation."

Priest Was Trusted Friend of the Family


Mark Bashforth said that Wempe, who was a trusted family friend, began molesting him when he was 12. Then Wempe turned his attentions to Lee, who was 8, the brothers claim. They allege they were molested on overnight trips and during other activities.

Lee Bashforth said he recalled the abuse, which he had suppressed from his memory, about a month ago, watching coverage of the growing sex scandal. He said he had allowed Wempe to help officiate at his wedding ceremony last year.

"Do you think I'd let him anywhere near my wedding, if I had remembered?" Lee said.

After recalling the abuse, Lee Bashforth said, he called Mark, 39, and they began to sob together on the telephone.

"Because it such a traumatic



WALLY SKALLI / Los Angeles Times

'Fourteen years [later] is so different. If that had been today, he would have been out of the priesthood.'

Cardinal Roger M. Mahony, on Father Michael Wempe

**Statement for Weekend Masses at St. Mary, Palmdale
April 20-21, 2002
Regarding REDACTED and Father Michael Wempe**

As you may have learned from recent press reports, there have been allegations of past inappropriate behavior with minors on the part of Father Michael Wempe and REDACTED REDACTED News of the abuse of our young people and the betrayal of the role of a priest is always very distressing.

REDACTED

Father Wempe was also removed from priestly ministry. He served on the faculty of Paraclete High School and was in residence here at St. Mary's from 1978 until 1984.

If any parishioners have information to report that might assist in any police investigation, please contact [*please insert the name and location of the police/sheriff department that serves your community*]. We encourage you to do so.

In light of the need to protect our children, I wish to make you aware of the steps the Archdiocese is taking to provide help in this difficult situation. First, I invite any other person who might have been mistreated by Father Michael Wempe or by REDACTED to inform me or to inform the Assistance Ministry Office of the Archdiocese as soon as possible. This will enable us to extend appropriate pastoral care to anyone harmed by them and also report that misconduct to the appropriate authorities. Next week at the conclusion of Mass, we will distribute copies of the brochure, *Respecting the Boundaries: Keeping Ministerial Relationships Healthy and Holy*. This brochure contains important information about sexual misconduct, and includes the telephone of the Assistance Ministry Office.

Additionally, we are making information available through the parish offices (rectory, school and religious education program) on child abuse prevention, counseling agencies and other community resources.

Our faith teaches that children are precious in God's eyes. Let's work together to make our homes, parishes and schools safe-havens for all our children.

REDACTED

**Declaración para las Misas del Fin de Semana en Santa Maria, Palmdale
20-21 de abril 2002
Acerca de REDACTED y Padre Michael Wempe**

Quizás ya saben por los reportes de los medios de comunicación que se han hecho alegaciones de conducta inapropiada en el pasado de parte de Padre Michael Wempe y REDACTED Las noticias del abuso de nuestros jóvenes y la traición del papel del sacerdote siempre nos angustian.

REDACTED

El Padre Wempe también fue removido del ministerio sacerdotal. Él sirvió en la facultad de la escuela secundaria Paraclete y estuvo en residencia aquí en Santa Maria desde el 1978 hasta el 1984.

Si algún parroquiano tiene información que quiera reportar y que pueda servir a las policías en alguna investigación, por favor comuníquese con [*please insert the name and location of the police/sheriff department that serves your community.*] Les invitamos que lo hagan.

Con el propósito de cuidar a nuestros niños quiero hacerles saber los pasos que está tomando la Arquidiócesis para ayudar en esta muy difícil situación. Primero, si alguna persona fue maltratada por el Padre Michael Wempe o REDACTED le invito a esa persona que me informe al respecto o le informe a la Oficina de Ministerio de Asistencia lo antes posible. Esto nos facilitará extenderles la ayuda pastoral mas apropiada a cualquier persona que haya sido dañada por ellos, y más, nos ayudará reportar la mala conducta a las autoridades apropiadas. En la próxima semana les repartiremos después de las Misas el folleto titulado *Respetar los Límites! Mantener las Relaciones Ministeriales Sanas y Santa*. Este folleto contiene importante información sobre el tema de abuso sexual, más incluye el número telefónico del la Oficina del Ministerio de Asistencia.

Además les haremos disponibles a todos ustedes información a través de las oficinas de la parroquia (rectoría, escuelas, y programas de catequesis) programas de prevención de abuso de menores, agencias de consejería, y otros recursos comunitarios.

Nuestra fe nos enseña que nuestros hijos son preciosos en los ojos de Dios. Trabajemos todos juntos para ser de nuestros hogares, parroquias y escuelas refugios seguros para todos nuestros niños.

REDACTED

SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE REPORT**To be Completed by Reporting Party****A. Case Identification**

To be completed by Investigating CPA

REDACTED

Victim Name: Wernke

Report No./Case Name: _____

Date of Report: _____

B. Victim

NAME/TITLE

REDACTED

Complainant

ADDRESS: REDACTED

PHONE REDACTED	DATE OF REPORT <u>4-21-02</u>	BIRTHDATE	SEX	RACE
-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------	-----	------

C. CallOFFICIAL CONTACTED
REDACTED

REDACTED

PHONE
REDACTEDDATE/TIME
4/21/02**D. Other Parties**

NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)

ADDRESS

REDACTED

NAME OF CHURCH OR SCHOOL

ADDRESS AT TIME OF INCIDENT

DATE/TIME OF INCIDENT

PLACE OF INCIDENT

(Check One)

Occurred ☐Observed ☐

TYPE OF SEXUAL ABUSE:

None - REDACTED

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:

F. Perpetrator InformationFrs. Wernke - St. Sebastian

Signed _____

254751

Wfmp

SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE REPORT**To be Completed by Reporting Party****A. Case Identification**

To be completed by Investigator CPA

Victim Name: REDACTED

Report No./Case Name: *Wernpe*

Date of Report:

B. Victim

NAME/TITLE

Complainant: REDACTED

ADD REDACTED

PHONE REDACTED	DATE OF REPORT <i>4-21-02</i>	BIRTHDATE	SEX	RACE
-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------	-----	------

C. Call

REDACTED

OFFICIAL CONTACTED

REDACTED

PHONE

DATE/TIME

REDACTED

*4/21/02***D. Other Parties**

NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)

ADDRESS

PRESENT LOCATION OF

REDACTED

NAME OF CHURCH OR SCHOOL

ADDRESS AT TIME OF INCIDENT

DATE/TIME OF INCIDENT

PLACE OF INCIDENT

(Check One)

Occurred ☐Observed ☐

TYPE OF SEXUAL ABUSE:

None - REDACTED

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:

F. Perpetrator Information*[REDACTED] - St. Sebastian*

Signed _____

254635

CCI 003422

REDACTED

28 June 2002

U.S. Mail and Fax

REDACTED

REDACTED

RE: **PRIVACY OF CLIENT'S FILES / ASSERTION OF PRIVILEGES**
 MY CLIENT: FATHER MICHAEL WEMPE

Dear REDACTED

I am informed that, in your position as outside counsel for the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles, you are in the process of reviewing the personnel files, including the so-called "C-files," pertaining to my above-named client. I am further informed that may disclose certain information found within my client's files to the Los Angeles *Times*, and possibly other media entities.

On my client's behalf, I vehemently object to such disclosure and demand that you take all steps necessary to prevent such an action. My client has a Constitutional Right of Privacy that clearly applies to every piece of information in his files. Much of the information is further protected by other specific privileges and statutes, including, but not limited to, the Attorney-Client Privilege, Therapist-Patient Privilege, Civil Code 56.20, 42 USC 290 (dd) (2), and the Consumer Records Act. Some of those statutes provide for specific civil penalties against the person who violates them by making an unlawful disclosure.

Virtually everything found within the sensitive "C-file" is protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege, which my client holds equally with the Archbishop under the rules of *Chadbourn v. Superior Court* and *Upjohn v. United States*, decided by the California and United States Supreme Courts respectively. As an attorney, you are obligated to assert that privilege at every peril to yourself, and owe that duty as much to my client as to your own.

I do not pretend to know Canonical Law, but I have been informed by more than one canonical lawyer that canonical law also protects the contents of these files, and a breach of those canons would be a serious matter.

Your threatened action would constitute a grave violation of my client's rights, for which you could incur actionable liability.

254812

In the light of the foregoing, I trust you will reconsider your proposed action, and respect the privacy, privileges, and rights of my client. He does not wish to feed the media frenzy with any information from his private files, and forbids you to do that.

I would be happy to discuss the matter with you at your convenience.

Very truly yours,
REDACTED

254813

CCI 003424

REDACTED

COPY

7/1/2002

Cardinal Roger Mahony
 Archbishop of Los Angeles
 555 West Temple Street
 Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Compensation for Sexual Abuse by Father Michael Wempe

Dear Cardinal Mahony:

As we discussed in Dallas, I am formally requesting compensation from the Archdiocese of Los Angeles for physical damages including, but not limited to emotional stress and depression from the sexual abuse. For the specifics of the actual events, I would refer you to the report of sexual abuse (of a minor child) filed with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department, in late May.

Since putting a dollar figure to these damages is difficult given the limited information available, I have created a list of the major damages (not comprehensive, but a start) and assigned them a dollar value, realizing that money does not heal, but that compensation is a real part of restitution in the sense of "making right" a past wrong.

Damages related to the following issues

Depression, Sleep disorder, Stress & Anxiety	- \$500,000
15 years of failed personal relationships	- \$200,000
Loss of Faith and trust in God	- \$200,000
Division and mistrust within my family of origin	- \$150,000
Marital problems around personal and sexual intimacy	- \$200,000
Struggles with issues of self-worth	- \$200,000
Loss of innocence regarding sexual abuse	- \$400,000
Years of therapy related to my abuse	- \$150,000

Future Issues

Depression, Sleep disorder, Stress & Anxiety	- \$100,000
Continued therapy	- \$100,000
Continued Medical treatment and the negative insurance related issues due to treatment	- \$100,000

	\$2,300,000

REDACTED

I believe this figure represents a trade-off for all involved, reducing the emotional and legal costs associated with such a settlement. This settlement would allow me the resources to offer my time to you on a larger scale to help with the actions to bring about changes in the Church and the parishioners that would end this kind of issue for the Church in the United States. I worked the numbers out from the components as listed and checked the bottom line with recently awarded court case (subtracting the attorney's fees) and it seems in line with current jury considerations for past abuse.

I look forward to working with you to reach an arrangement that will be suitable to all and enable us to work closer on issues related to victims and changes in the Church. Please advise me as to the next steps in this process, as I would like this to move forward and not slow any participation I could have with the Church in dealing with sexual abuse by priests.

Best Regards,
REDACTED

WGMPE

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION THREE

REDACTED

et al., .

Petitioners,

y.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY OF
LOS ANGELES,

Respondent,

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Real Party in Interest.

)
) No. B160315
)")
) (LASC No.
) BH001298)

RECEIVED
AUG 13 2003

Original proceedings
from the Superior Court of Los Angeles County
The Honorable Dan Thomas Oki, Judge

MOTION FOR EARLY FINALITY

REDACTED

REDACTED

Deputy District Attorneys
Appellate Division
320 West Temple Street, Suite 540
Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: (213) 974-5914
Attorney for Real Party in Interest

254786

DEC - 9 2002

EXHIBIT

DECLARATION OF REDACTED

I, REDACTED declare:

1. I, REDACTED declare that I am an attorney licensed to practice law in California, and I am employed by the Office of the District Attorney of Los Angeles County. I am assigned to the Sex Crimes Division of the District Attorney's office, and I am the Assistant Head Deputy of that Division. As the assistant head deputy, my duties include assisting in the day-to-day supervision of the deputies assigned to the Sex Crimes Division.

2. The Sex Crimes Division has asked the Los Angeles County Grand Jury to Conduct an investigation into allegations of sexual abuse of children which Petitioners are alleged to have committed while employed as priests by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles. I, together with my head deputy REDACTED am assisting in that investigation. In furtherance of the grand jury investigation, grand jury subpoenas were served on the Custodian of Records for the Archdiocese of Los Angeles requiring production of some of Petitioner's employment records. The records requested are those that relate to allegations of sexual abuse of children. The Archdiocese turned the records over to the superior court in compliance with the subpoena, but the Petitioners moved to quash the subpoenas and made other objections to turning the records over to the grand jury. The superior court held a hearing on the Petitioners motions to quash, and overruled those motions. The superior court also deferred ruling on some of Petitioners' contentions with respect to privileges. The Petitioners have filed a petition with this court, contending that the grand jury subpoenas should have been quashed. This court has stayed all proceedings pending its review. Before this court had issued its stay, the superior court had begun a review of the subpoenaed documents to determine which were relevant to the subpoenas, and to separate those that are potentially subject to privilege from those that are not. When this court issued its stay, the superior court suspended its review of the documents pending finality of this court's decision.

3. After this court granted review, the People filed a criminal complaint charging petitioner, REDACTED, with 26 counts of child sexual abuse.

4. On December 2, 2002, this court issued its decision denying the petition for writ of mandate, however, until that decision becomes final, and the time for Supreme Court review has passed, further proceedings in the superior court with regard to review of the subpoenaed documents and litigation of issues regarding privacy and privileges cannot go forward.

5. I have reviewed the statute of limitations applicable to each of Petitioner's cases (Pen. Code, § 803, subd. (g)), and have determined that the statute of limitations with regard to the allegations involving Michael W. expire in April of 2003. The allegations against REDACTED were not covered by Penal Code section 803, subdivision (g), and the statute of limitations had expired as to those allegations by the time the allegations were reported to authorities. A grand jury investigation in REDACTED case was nevertheless underway to determine whether there are other offenses that may be charged.

6. In order that the statute of limitations not expire in the case Michael W., it is vital that the superior court complete its review of the documents, all litigation with respect to those documents be completed, and the grand jury complete its investigation before April of next year. For these reasons, it is important that this court's decision be final at the earliest possible date. In addition to the subpoenas issued in the Petitioners' cases, there have been 14 additional subpoenas issued for records of other priests, former priests and employees of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, and the superior court has ordered that any action on those cases be stayed pending the results in this case. The statute of limitations is running on 9 of those cases as well, and will expire in March, April and May of 2003.

Executed December 6, 2002, at Los Angeles, California.

REDACTED

Deputy District Attorney

REDACTED

12/28/92

Have taken him off payroll. Both AB and I wrote to him recently. You may be hearing from him.

REDACTED

'92 Wempe, Michael St. Ambrose Church, Los Angeles

Mike is in need of some kind of supervision. Would be good to check with him and have him go see Dr. REDACTED at least on a quarterly basis. Would be very reluctant to make him a pastor.

Message

Page 1 of 1

REDACTED

From: REDACTED**Sent:** Thursday, June 19, 2003 9:43 AM**To:** REDACTED**Subject:** Fr. REDACTED called for Msgr. Cox REDACTED

I called Msgr. Cox and passed the information along to him at 9:40 am this morning.

Fr. Mike Wempe has been arrested and is in Twin Towers under a 2 million dollar bail. He faces what Fr. REDACTED said is 300 counts. Fr. Wempe's attorney is REDACTED. His phone number is REDACTED. He works with REDACTED

Msgr. Cox is going to call Fr. Wempe's attorney and then try to contact REDACTED

254801

6/19/2003

CCI 003431



MEMORANDUM

TO: All Members of the Presbyterate
FROM: Monsignor Craig A. Cox
RE: Arrest of Father Michael Wempe
DATE: 19 June 2003

My brothers,

It is my sad duty to report to you that Father Michael Wempe was arrested today on charges related to sexual misconduct with minors.

I ask that you please keep everyone involved in your prayers.

IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF MALIBU JUDICIAL DISTRICT,
 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 NO. SA049132
 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA VS.
 DEFENDANT 01: MICHAEL WEMPE

PAGE NO. 1
 CURRENT DATE 08/05/03

DOB 11/01/39 OLN F0793210 CA VLN
 LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY EFFECTING ARREST: LASD - LOST HILLS STATION

BAIL: APPEARANCE DATE	AMOUNT OF BAIL	DATE POSTED	RECEIPT OR BOND NO.	SURETY COMPANY	REGISTER NUMBER
--------------------------	-------------------	----------------	------------------------	----------------	--------------------

CASE FILED ON 06/23/03.


COMPLAINT FILED, DECLARED OR SWORN TO CHARGING DEFENDANT WITH HAVING
 COMMITTED, ON OR ABOUT 11/21/77 IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, THE FOLLOWING
 OFFENSE(S) OF:

COUNT 01: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 02: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 03: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 04: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 05: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.

COUNT 06: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 07: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 08: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 09: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 10: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.

COUNT 11: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 12: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 13: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 14: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 15: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 16: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 17: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 18: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 19: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 20: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 21: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 22: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 23: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 24: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 25: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 26: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.

COUNT 27: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 28: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 29: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 30: 288(A) PC FEL - LEWD ACTS WITH CHILD UNDER 14.
 COUNT 31: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 32: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 33: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 34: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 35: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 36: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 37: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 38: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 39: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 40: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.
 COUNT 41: 288 PC FEL - COMMIT LEWD ACTS*.



254782

CASE NO. SA049132
DEF NO. 01

PAGE NO. 2
DP PRINTED 08/05/03

COUNT 42: 288A(B)(1) PC FEL - ORAL COPULATION W/PERS UND 18.
NEXT SCHEDULED EVENT:
06/23/03 830 AM ARRAIGNMENT DIST MALIBU DIV 001

ON 06/23/03 AT 830 AM IN MALIBU DIV 001

CASE CALLED FOR ARRAIGNMENT
PARTIES: REDACTED (JUDGE) REDACTED (CLERK)
REDACTED (REP) REDACTED (DA)
DEFENDANT IS PRESENT IN COURT, AND REPRESENTED BY REDACTED PRIVATE
COUNSEL

BAIL SET AT \$2,000,000

DEFENSE MOTION TO DENY MEDIA COVERAGE IS DENIED.
NO VISUAL MEDIA COVERAGE WILL BE ALLOWED ON DEFENDANT.
DEFENSE MOTION TO CONTINUE TO PREPARE FOR ARRAIGNMENT IS GRANTED
DISCOVERY GIVEN TO DEFENSE ATTORNEY TODAY. TIME WAIVED

DEFENSE ARGUMENT HEARD REGARDING BAIL. MOTION TO REDUCE DENIED.
SHOULD DEFENDANT BE RELEASED ON BAIL AS PRESENTLY SET, DEFENDANT
IS ORDERED TO OBEY ALL LAWS; STAY AWAY FROM ALL NAMED VICTIMS, &
WITNESSES IDENTIFIED IN THE DISCOVERY AND MINORS.

NO PERSONAL CONTACT WITH VICTIMS, WITNESSES, AND MINORS.

MEDICAL ORDER SIGNED AND FORWARDED TO THE SHERIFF'S TIME.
NEXT SCHEDULED EVENT:

UPON MOTION OF DEFENDANT
07/08/03 830 AM ARRAIGNMENT DIST MALIBU DIV 001

CUSTODY STATUS: REMANDED TO CUSTODY

ON 06/26/03 AT 830 AM IN MALIBU DIV 001

CASE CALLED FOR BAIL REVIEW
PARTIES: REDACTED (JUDGE) REDACTED (CLERK)
REDACTED (REP) REDACTED (DA)
DEFENDANT IS NOT PRESENT IN COURT, BUT REPRESENTED BY REDACTED PRIVATE
COUNSEL

DUE TO A SUPREME COURT RULING MADE TODAY RE: THE ISSUES IN
THIS CASE THE DEFENDANT IS RELEASED O.R.
THE SAME TERMS OF BAIL PREVIOUSLY IMPOSED ARE NOW A
CONDITION OF O.R.
RELEASE # AA000264 IS ISSUED.

THE DATE OF 7-8-03 REMAINS ON CALENDAR FOR ARRAIGNMENT.
COURT ORDERS AND FINDINGS:

-THE COURT ORDERS THE DEFENDANT TO APPEAR ON THE NEXT COURT DATE.

NEXT SCHEDULED EVENT:
MATTER PREV SET/REMAIN ON CLDR

CUSTODY STATUS: RELEASED ON OWN RECOGNIZANCE

ON 07/08/03 AT 830 AM IN MALIBU DIV 001

254783

CCI 003434

CASE NO. SA049132
DEF NO. 01

PAGE NO. 3
DA PRINTED 08/05/03

CASE CALLED FOR ARRAIGNMENT
PARTIES: COMMR. REDACTED (JUDGE) REDACTED (CLERK)
REDACTED (REP) REDACTED (DA)
DEFENDANT IS PRESENT IN COURT, AND REPRESENTED BY REDACTED PRIVATE
COUNSEL

COUNT (01) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (02) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (03) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (04) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (05) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (06) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (07) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (08) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (09) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (10) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (11) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (12) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC

COUNT (13) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (14) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (15) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (16) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (17) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (18) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (19) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (20) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (21) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (22) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (23) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (24) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (25) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (26) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (27) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (28) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (29) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (30) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (31) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (32) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (33) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC

COUNT (34) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (35) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (36) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (37) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (38) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (39) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (40) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (41) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC
COUNT (42) : DISPOSITION: DISMISSAL IN FURTH OF JUSTICE PER 1385 PC

THE PEOPLE'S MOTION TO DISMISS COUNT 01, 02, 03, AND 04 BECAUSE
THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS HAS EXPIRED IS GRANTED.
NEXT SCHEDULED EVENT:
PROCEEDINGS TERMINATED
NEXT SCHEDULED EVENT 2:
OR DISCHARGED

254784

CCI 003435

CASE NO. SA049132
DEF NO. 01

PAGE NO. 4
DA PRINTED 08/05/03

ON 07/11/03 AT 900 AM :

DISPOSITION OF ARREST AND COURT ACTION IS FORWARDED TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT.
PROCEEDINGS TERMINATED



JOHN A. CLARKE, Executive Officer/Clerk, Los Angeles Superior Court, Malibu Courthouse, County of Los Angeles, State of California, certify the foregoing instrument to be a correct copy of the original copy now on file in this Court.

Attest this 5th day of August, 20 03.

By: C. Drake **C. DRAKE**
Deputy Clerk

254785



MEMORANDUM

TO: REDACTED

FROM: Monsignor Craig A. Cox

RE: Request for Loan from Father Michael Wempe

DATE: 6 September 2003

I received the attached letter from Mike Wempe. Please note that he has already been extended loans for [REDACTED] which is the maximum amount according to our policy.

All criminal charges against him have been dropped. Of course, he is still named in several of the prospective civil suits.

In accord with our policy, since there has been no prosecution (even though on the basis of the statute of limitation), we normally would forgive the [REDACTED]. I don't believe our policy envisions reimbursing priests for costs they incur greater than [REDACTED]. That may be a lacuna.

Could we chat about this next Wednesday when the CMOB meeting is over?

Thank you.

attachment



MEMORANDUM

TO: All Priests

FROM: Monsignor Craig A. Cox
Vicar for Clergy

RE: Keeping You Informed

DATE: 10 September 2003

My brothers,

It is my sad duty to report to you that Father Michael Wempe has again been arrested on charges of sexual misconduct with minors. The incidents alleged relate to a period of time within the criminal statute of limitations.

As you know, Father Wempe has been out of any ministry since February of 2002.

I have no further information at this time. I ask that you please keep everyone involved in your prayers.

254780

CCI 003439

Cox, Msgr. Craig A.

From: REDACTED
 Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2004 9:51 AM
 To: Cardinal Mahony; Cox, Msgr. Craig A.; REDACTED
 Subject: REDACTED
 AP story on Wempe

All:

Please note the very different tone and focus of this story as compared to that which appeared in today's L.A. Times.
 REDACTED

Former child victim testifies in priest abuse case
 Associated Press

LOS ANGELES - A 24-year-old man testified Monday that a retired Roman Catholic priest who once served as the chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center fondled him on several occasions from 1990 to 1995.

The testimony against the Rev. Michael Wempe, 63, was part of hearing to determine if the case should be sent to trial. He faces three counts of a lewd act on a child and one count of oral copulation of a person under 16.

Wempe was charged last June with molesting five boys, ages 7 to 15, between 1977 and 1986 in Los Angeles, Ventura and San Diego counties.

Wempe never had to stand trial for those alleged crimes when the nation's high court struck down a California law that erased the statute of limitations on sexual abuses cases from 1988 and earlier.

The priest was nonetheless forced into retirement in 2002 and is not allowed to perform priestly functions.

He was arrested again in September after the man came forward with allegations that he was molested by Wempe over a five-year period.

The man testified that Wempe was a family friend who had also allegedly molested his two brothers. He said Wempe fondled him and left him feeling "embarrassed, ashamed."

The man decided to tell authorities about the alleged crimes after he learned Wempe was freed from jail and would only be accountable if he revealed what had happened.

"I realized that justice was too big a price to pay for my secret," the man said.

REDACTED

81809

REDACTED

District Attorney for the County of Los Angeles
 REDACTED Deputy District Attorney
 Sex Crimes Division
 Hall of Records Building
 320 West Temple Street, Suite 777
 Los Angeles, California 90012
 (213) 974-9777
 Attorney for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
 Plaintiff,

v.

Michael Edwin [REDACTED]

Defendant

CASE NUMBER
 BA253178

SUBPENA
 Duces Tecum
 APPLICATION
 FOR SUBPENA DUCES TECUM
 CRIMINAL

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA TO: Custodian of Records, Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

We command you, that all singular business and excuses laid aside, you attend a session of the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles to be held at the Courtroom of Department No. "129" located at 210 West Temple Street, City of Los Angeles on June 8, 2004, at 8:30 a.m., then and there to testify as a witness in this action on the part of the People and that you bring with you and there produce the documents now in your custody or under your control, described in the copy of the application for subpoena duces tecum attached hereto which is incorporated herein by reference.

You must appear at that time unless you make a special agreement to appear another time, etc., with:

REDACTED, Deputy District Attorney at REDACTED

Failure to appear on the date set forth herein or at such other time or upon such notice as may have been agreed to with the party at whose request this subpoena was issued may be punished as contempt by this court. You may also be liable for the sum of five hundred dollars and all damages to such party resulting from your failure to attend. (Penal Code Sec. 1331, 1331.5)

Given under my hand this 26th day of May, 2004

STEVE COOLEY
 District Attorney /

REDACTED

By Deputy District Attorney
 REDACTED

254771

APPLICATION FOR SUBPENA DUCES TECUM

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, County of Los Angeles

The undersigned states: That he is the attorney of record for the People of the State of California, Defendant, in the above entitled action/that said cause was duly set down for jury trial June 8, 2004, at 8:30 a.m., in Department "129" of the above entitled court.

That Custodian of Records for the Archdiocese of Los Angeles has in his possession or under his control the following documents:

Any and all documents and other materials that are in the possession, custody, or control of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles that relate in any manner to allegations of child molestation or sexual abuse committed by Father Michael Edwin Wempe.

The subpoenaed documents and other materials include, but are not limited to, documents in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles' general archives, general files, secret archives, secret files, sub secreto files, sub secreto archives, personnel files, confidential personnel files, locked files, and investigative files as well as memoranda, correspondence, reports, personnel evaluations, interviews, statements, notes, contracts, agreements, insurance policies, insurance contracts, insurance agreements, case settlement agreements, confidentiality agreements, and records of payment relating in any way to allegations of child molestation and sexual abuse committed by Father Michael Edwin Wempe.

The subpoenaed documents and other materials include, but are not limited to all documents in hard copy paper form or stored electronically in computers; printouts of information stored in computers or other retention or procession systems; computer files; e-mail communications; photographs; sound reproduction material in any form; and any other material that is typed, written, handwritten, audio tape recorded, video tape recorded, reproduced, or recorded in any manner that is related in any way to allegations of child molestation or sexual abuse committed by Father Michael Edwin Wempe.

The subpoenaed documents and other material include, but are not limited to, all records pertaining to the transfer of Father Michael Edwin Wempe from Archdiocese church parish to another. These Archdiocese church parishes include, but are not limited to, (1) Saint John Chrysostom Church in Inglewood, (2) Saint Andrew's Church in Pasadena, (3) Saint Rose of Lima Church in Simi Valley, (4) Saint Jude's Church in Westlake Village, (5) Sacred Heart Church in Saticoy, (6) Saint Sebastian's Church in Santa Paula, (7) Saint Mary's Church in Palmdale, (8) Immaculate Heart Church in Los Angeles, and (9) Saint Elizabeth's Church in Lake Hughes. Furthermore, the subpoenaed documents and other material include all records pertaining to the employment of Father Michael Edwin Wempe with Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in Los Angeles where Father Wempe acted as the hospital Catholic chaplain from 1990 to 2002.

The subpoenaed documents are to be provided regardless of their location within the Archdiocese of Los Angeles or within the custody or control of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles including, but not limited to, any Archdiocese administrative office, archival storage facility, storage facility, church parish, church rectory, church mission, church residence, or church school.

The subpoenaed documents or materials include any "green page", "green sheet", or "green card" from personnel files or other files indicating that information is on file or located elsewhere. If documents or other material have been moved, relocated or transferred outside the jurisdiction of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, then a declaration shall be prepared identifying the documents or other materials that were transferred, the precise location where the documents and other materials were transferred, and what persons were involved with said

transfer. All documentation pertaining to the transfer is requested.

Any subpoenaed documents and other material considered to be privileged by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles shall be produced with a detailed statement describing the item for which a privilege is asserted, the subject matter of the item for which a privilege is asserted, the names of all individuals appearing on the item for which a privilege is asserted, and the basis for the asserted privilege.

That the above documents are material to the issues involved in the case by reason of the following facts: The aforementioned records are necessary to prove and corroborate the nature and extent of sexual abuse suffered by alleged victim REDACTED when he was a minor. Further, the records are necessary to prove and corroborate the nature and extent of sexual abuse suffered by witnesses REDACTED REDACTED when these men were minors. The purported victim and the witnesses all allege and will testify that Father Michael Edwin Wempe abused them as children.

That good cause exists for the production of the above described matters and things by reason of the following facts: The custodian of records has exclusive control and possession of the records which are necessary for the prosecution of the defendant.

WHEREFORE request is made that Subpena Duces Tecum issue.

Executed May 26, 2004, at Los Angeles, California.

REDACTED

Signature of Declarant

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, County of Los Angeles

I the undersigned state that: I served the foregoing subpoena by showing the original and delivering a true copy thereof, together with a copy of the application in support thereof, to each of the following named persons,

NAME OF PERSON SERVED: Custodian of Records, Archdiocese of Los Angeles

DATE OF SERVICE: May 27, 2004

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed: May 27, 2004, at Los Angeles, California.

Signature of Declarant

254774

CCI 003444

AFFIDAVIT AND STATEMENT OF GOOD CAUSE IN SUPPORT
OF APPLICATION FOR SUBPENA DUCES TECUM

I, REDACTED, declare that:

1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California and employed by the Office of the District Attorney for Los Angeles County.

2. That I am assigned to prosecute the case of People v. Michael Edwin Wempe, case number BA253178;

3. That I have personally reviewed various police reports filed by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department which have stated and/or I have personally interviewed alleged victim REDACTED and purported witnesses REDACTED REDACTED

Detective REDACTED of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and Detective REDACTED of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department who have related the following:

4. That on or between the dates of October 29, 1990 and October 28, 1995, REDACTED was the alleged victim of three sexually lewd acts against a child and one act of oral copulation perpetrated against a minor committed by Father Michael Edwin Wempe. These sex acts perpetrated against a child all occurred when Father Wempe was an active Catholic priest in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Two of the acts of sexual molestation occurred on the premises of Cedars-Sinai Medical Center while Father Wempe was serving as the hospital's chaplain under the supervision of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

5. Moreover, alleged victim, REDACTED, has told Detective REDACTED and I that Father Wempe was a long time family friend of his mother and that REDACTED family first met Father Wempe when he was a priest assigned to Saint Jude's Church in Westlake Village. REDACTED and his family reportedly lived in REDACTED REDACTED for a number of years before moving to REDACTED.

6. Witnesses REDACTED and REDACTED have reported to Detective REDACTED and I that they are REDACTED two older brothers. They have stated to Detective REDACTED and I that while Father Wempe was a priest at Saint Jude's Church, he

reportedly molested them both between the years 1975 and 1986 when they were minors. The alleged abuse inflicted upon REDACTED and REDACTED by Father Wempe continued when the priest was moved to Sacred Heart Church in Saticoy and later to Saint Mary's Church in Palmdale. The move was effected under the direction of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. The abuse against witnesses REDACTED and REDACTED REDACTED occurred while Father Wempe was an associate pastor at Sacred Heart and Saint Mary's parishes. The asserted abuse occurred in church rectories located on parish grounds and in vehicles paid for or provided to Father Wempe by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

7. Furthermore, witnesses REDACTED and his brother REDACTED have alleged that Father Wempe sexually abused them when they were minors. The purported abuse occurred while Father Wempe was a priest assigned to Saint Rose of Lima Church in Simi Valley and Saint Jude's Church in Westlake Village. The abuse occurred between the years 1971 through 1977 in rectories located on parish grounds. REDACTED reported to Detective REDACTED that he informed his mother about Father Wempe's sexual molestation of him and that Father Wempe later apologized to him for his actions. Moreover, during Father Wempe's apology, the priest reportedly told REDACTED that he was under going therapy from a psychiatrist for his admitted "problem".

8. Additionally in 1988, both REDACTED and REDACTED stated that they both spoke to REDACTED about Father Wempe and informed this Los Angeles Archdiocese official that Father Wempe had molested them when they were children. Witnesses REDACTED have stated that REDACTED reportedly told them that Father Wempe had been taken out of active ministry by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles for his alleged acts of child molestation and had been reassigned to an out-of-state Catholic monastery for treatment. Both witnesses state that REDACTED did not name the monastery, but confided to them during this meeting that it was his personal opinion that Father Wempe's therapy was not progressing as had been hoped by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. I have learned during the investigation of this matter that Father Wempe was taken back into active ministry by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles sometime in 1989 and was later assigned to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. It was at this location that

he perpetrated his alleged encounters with victim REDACTED. Also, REDACTED's mother, REDACTED, told Detective REDACTED that Father Wempe renewed his acquaintance with their family at a 1989 Los Angeles Archdiocese celebration for Father Wempe's 25th year in the priesthood.

9. Furthermore, it is known by the People that Father Wempe was removed from the priesthood by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles and was sent to a Catholic monastery in the state of New Mexico called the "Servants of the Paraclete" for treatment and counseling in June 1987. Father Wempe remained at the "Servants of the Paraclete" monastery from June 1987 until October 1987. He then returned to the same monastery for additional treatment in December 1987. In 1989, he was reinstated back into active ministry and was later assigned to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in Los Angeles as a hospital chaplain. Still later, in 2002, Father Wempe was removed from active ministry by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles based upon the direct orders of Cardinal Roger Mahony.

10. Lastly, witnesses REDACTED and REDACTED have told Detectives REDACTED and REDACTED and are prepared to testify in open court that Father Wempe sexually molested them when they were minors. All of the acts of alleged child sexual abuse occurred while Father Wempe served as a priest at various Los Angeles Archdiocese parishes. Moreover, the witnesses state that some of the purported acts of sexual abuse occurred on parish grounds, in church buildings, in church rectories or in vehicles furnished or paid for by the Los Angeles Archdiocese to Father Wempe for his own use while on church business.

The material sought by the People is needed to corroborate the statements of victim REDACTED as well as witnesses REDACTED in this criminal matter.

///

///

///

///

///

254777

I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY that the above statement is true and correct.

REDACTED

DATED: May 26, 2004

DECLARANT

254778

CCI 003448



FILE

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of
Vicar for Clergy
(213) 637-7284

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

November 18, 2004

Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo, J.C.D.
Apostolic Nunciature
3339 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

RE: Reverend Michael E. Wempe

Your Excellency:

Enclosed, please find a letter from Cardinal Roger M. Mahony to Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger at the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, regarding Reverend Michael E. Wempe. With his letter are copies of the completed summary pages requested by the Congregation. All materials are submitted in triplicate.


Cardinal Mahony is seeking the assistance of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in this matter.

Would you please be so kind as to forward this to the Congregation on our behalf?

Also enclosed is a check made out to the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith to cover the usual *taxa* in such matters.

Thank you very much for your kind attention to this matter. May God continue to bless you!

Yours in Christ,


Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
Vicar for Clergy

enclosures

104927

Check Date: 16.Nov.2004

ACCLA

Check No.

Invoice Number	Invoice Date	Voucher ID	Gross Amount	Discount Available	Paid Amount
517 VC	15.Nov.2004	00118811	500.00	0.00	500.00

104928

Vendor Number	Name			Total Discounts	
0000002838	Congregation For The Doctrine			\$0.00	
Check Number	Date		Total Amount	Discounts Taken	Total Paid Amount
	16.Nov.2004		\$500.00	\$0.00	\$500.00

DO NOT CASH THIS DOCUMENT OR HAVE A LARGE PRINT IMAGE OF THIS SECURED DOCUMENT TO GO OVER A TRADING PARTNER OF THE WORDS SECURED DOCUMENT



The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles
 (A Corporation Sole)
 3424 Wilshire Blvd.
 Los Angeles, California 90010-2241
 (213) 637-7691

Wachovia Bank, N.A.
 Greenville, South Carolina
 In Cooperation with & Payable If Desired at
 Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
 4759-613201 67-1/532

176246

Date November 16, 2004 Pay Amount \$ 500.00***

Pay *****FIVE HUNDRED AND XX / 100 US DOLLAR*****

To The
Order Of

REDACTED

CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE
 of the Faith
 Piazza Del S Offizio II
 00120 Vatican City

REDACTED



Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of
the Archbishop

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

17 November 2004

His Eminence
Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect
Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
Piazza Del S. Ufficio, 11
00120 VATICAN CITY

Re: Rev. Michael Edwin Wempe

Your Eminence:

It is with deep regret that I submit this report on alleged violations that fall under Article 4 of *Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela*, which involve a priest of this Archdiocese, Rev. Michael E. Wempe.

The numerous alleged victims are all males of pre- and early pubescent age. A criminal trial citing 42 counts of sexual abuse against five of the complainants was dismissed when the U.S. Supreme Court nullified the law which attempted to allow the retroactive prosecution of cases barred by the statute of limitation. A new criminal prosecution is in progress for alleged acts of sexual abuse against one complainant that are not barred by the statute of limitation.

Father Wempe has admitted to delictal acts involving some of the complainants, but strongly denies the accusations in the current criminal prosecution. Most of the denunciations we have received were made before the promulgation of the *motu proprio*, and involve actions that would be barred from a penal process by prescription.

Father Wempe was granted early retirement at age 62 in view of the moral impossibility of allowing him to continue in ministry owing to the previously reported sexual misconduct. In view of all these circumstances, as well as the public notoriety occasioned by the civil processes, the good of the Church requires that the strongest available measures be taken.


Given that a State criminal trial is still underway, it seems most appropriate to allow that proceeding to unfold prior to initiating a canonical penal process, so that the evidence developed during the State trial may be used.

I request therefore the grant of an exception to the prescription of all offenses against canon 1395 that may be determined to have occurred. I further request authorization to employ at an appropriate later time the procedures of canon 1720 with a view to imposing dismissal from the clerical state.

104929

If you believe that a different course of action is more appropriate, I welcome your advice on the matter. Entrusting this matter to your discretion and awaiting your instruction on how to proceed, I remain

Fraternally yours in Christ,

+ 

His Eminence
Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

104930

DIOCESE	Los Angeles in California
NAME OF ORDINARY	Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
CDF PROT. N. (if available)	
NAME OF CLERIC	Reverend Michael E. Wempe

PERSONAL DETAILS OF THE CLERIC	Date of Birth	REDACTED	Age	65
	Ordination	30 April 1966	Years of ministry	36
ORIGINAL DIOCESE OF INCARDINATION		Los Angeles in California		
MINISTRY IN/TRANSFER TO OTHER DIOCESE				
CONTACT ADDRESS OF THE CLERIC		REDACTED		
PROCURATOR (include original signed mandate)				
CONTACT ADDRESS OF THE PROCURATOR				
ASSIGNMENTS				
Year	Parish	Location	Appointment	
1966	St. John Chrysostom	Inglewood, California	Parochial Vicar	
1969	St. Andrew	Pasadena, California	Parochial Vicar	
1969	St. Rose of Lima	Simi Valley, California	Parochial Vicar	
1973	St. Jude	Westlake Village, California	Parochial Vicar	
1977	Sacred Heart	Ventura (Saticoy), California	Parochial Vicar	
1978	Paraclete High School	Palmdale, California	Faculty	
1978	St. Mary	Palmdale, California	Residence	
1984	St. Sebastian	Santa Paula, California	Parochial Vicar	
1986			Sabbatical	
1987	St. Sebastian	Santa Paula, California	Administrator	
1987			Sick Leave	
1988- 2002	Cedars-Sinai Hospital	Los Angeles, California	Chaplain	
1988	St. Ambrose	West Hollywood, California	Residence	
2001	Cathedral Chapel	Los Angeles, California	Residence	

2002	Private residence	Seal Beach, California	Early retirement without faculties.	
ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE CLERIC				
Year	Victim	Age	Imputable Acts	Denunciation
1991-1995	REDACTED	11-15	Placed boy on his lap and fondled genitals both over and under clothing; oral copulation; five occasions over a four year period.	2003
1977-1983		7-14	Massaging the boy's crotch during motorcycle rides; put hand inside shorts and manipulate the genitals; grabbing of buttocks; kissing; exposing himself to the boy; touching the boy with his penis. On one occasion, while helping the boy learn to drive, the priest put his hands inside the boy's pants and caused an accident, on passenger nearly died and the priest suffered severe internal injuries. Hundreds of incidents of abuse.	2003
1975-1978		12-15	Fondling of genitals while motorcycle riding; patting buttocks; fondling genitals underneath the boy's clothing; exposing himself to the boy;	2003
1974		15-16	Exposed himself to the complainant; fondled the boy's genitals; one occasion.	2003
1984-1987			Unspecified claim of molestation	2002
1984-1987			Unspecified claim of molestation	2002
1977-1981		11-15	Skin to skin fondling, approximately 150 occasions of abuse.	2003
1979		12-15	Arranged for the boy to sleep with him and put his hands under the pajamas and fondled the boy's genitals; aggressive pursuit of fondling; one incident of oral sex. Approximately 40-50 incidents of abusive activities over a two and a half year period.	2003
1979-1982		10-13	On camping and a skiing trip and on the motorcycle, unspecified abusive actions.	2003
1969-1977		?	Unspecified molestation	February 1988
1974-1977		13-15	During sleep-overs placing hand under pajamas; fondling penis and masturbating the boy to ejaculation.	February 1988
1980-1983		14-16	Fondling during motorcycle rides; fondling legs and buttocks; oral sex; mutual masturbation; one incident of anal rape. Over 50 incidents of various types of abuse.	2003
1976-1978		14-16	Fondling of genitals; grabbing penis while wrestling; oral copulation; masturbation; other sexual acts	March 2002

CIVIL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CLERIC			
Year	Type/Case	Conviction	Sentence (include copies of civil documents)
2002	Grand Jury/Trial Subpoenas	pending	
2003	Arrest; charged with 3 counts of improper touching and 1 count of oral copulation; preliminary stages of the trial have begun, but no trial date yet set.	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (SC036536), REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC308555), REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC308665) REDACTED	pending	
MEASURES ADOPTED BY THE DIOCESE			
Year			
1987	Intervention, Treatment at Servants of the Paraclete, Jemez Springs, New Mexico		
1988	Restoration to limited ministry		
2002	Retirement without faculties		
SUSTENANCE PROVIDED BY THE DIOCESE TO THE CLERIC			
<p>When placed on leave of absence in 2002, Father Wempe was provided with a monthly payment as well as with transportation.</p> <p>As of November 1, 2004 when he turned sixty-five years of age, his sustenance is provided through the Priests' Pension Fund of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.</p> <p>In accord with Archdiocesan policy, loans were extended to him during the period of the initial criminal investigation.</p>			
RESPONSE/RECOURSE MADE BY THE CLERIC			
Year			

BISHOP'S VOTUM

We request authorization of a canon 1720 procedure with the prospect that, if found guilty, the penalty of dismissal from the clerical state be imposed. We request dispensation from prescription, in order to assure that all of the charges against him can be tried in ecclesiastical court, even though some were denounced prior to the promulgation of *Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela*.

Given that there is a criminal trial underway, it is most appropriate to allow that proceeding to unfold prior to beginning the ecclesiastical trial, so that evidence developed during the State trial can be used in any ecclesiastical process.



3339 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008-3687

APOSTOLIC NUNCIATURE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

25.835

November 21, 2004

No.

This No. Should Be Prefixed to the Answer

Dear Monsignor Cox:

I acknowledge your kind letter of November 18, 2004,
with enclosures.

Rest assured that the correspondence concerning
Reverend Michael E. Wempe, including a check in amount \$500.00
for the taxa, will be duly forwarded through the diplomatic
pouch to His Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect,
Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

With cordial regards and best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo
Apostolic Nuncio

Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
Vicar for Clergy
Archdiocese of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90010-2241

104926

NOV 29 2004

PROFFER RE FATHER MICHAEL WEMPE

Date	Description
11/1/39	Michael Wempe born.
04/30/66	Wempe is ordained priest.
05/14/66	Wempe is assigned as Assistant at St. John Chrysostom, Inglewood.
03/25/69	Wempe is assigned as Assistant at St. Andrew, Pasadena.
09/02/69	Wempe is assigned as Assistant at St. Rose of Lima, Simi Valley.
06/11/73	Wempe is assigned as Associate at St. Jude, Westlake Village.
06/17/77	Wempe is assigned as Associate at Sacred Heart, Ventura.
02/20/78	Wempe is assigned as Teacher at Paraclete High School, Lancaster. Wempe is simultaneously assigned to Residence at St. Mary Church, Palmdale.
07/12/84	Wempe is assigned as Associate at St. Sebastian, Santa Paula.
09/01/86	Wempe attends Vatican II Institute (Sabbatical).
02/01/87	Wempe is assigned as Administrator Pro Tem at St. Sebastian, Santa Paula.
05/22/87	Wempe's pastor at St. Sebastian makes a written report to Vicar for Clergy concerning boundary violations. The Archdiocese will not contend that it lacked notice of Wempe's sexual interest toward minors following this report.
06/22/87 to 12/03/87	Wempe is assigned to residential psychotherapy at Foundation House, Servants of the Paraclete, Jemez Springs, New Mexico.
12/23/87	Report from Servants of the Paraclete to Cardinal Mahony.
01/18/88	Wempe is assigned to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center as chaplain and to St. Ambrose for residence.
02/05/88	First complaint by a victim - two brothers (REDACTED) complained of abuse by Wempe about 10 years earlier.
04/26/88	Wempe attends group therapy through September 15, 1989.
06/30/88	Wempe attends Servants of the Paraclete after-care program.
10/15/98	Wempe is assigned to Immaculate Heart of Mary, LA for residence. He continues as Chaplain at Cedars-Sinai.
02/01/02	Wempe is assigned to Cathedral Chapel, LA for residence. He continues as Chaplain at Cedars-Sinai.
02/15/02	Wempe is granted early retirement. He voluntarily retired at the request of Cardinal Mahony.
03/07/02	Victim (REDACTED) complaint letter to Cardinal Mahony re abuse in 1976 through 1978.



**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM**

Date of This Report to Public Authority: N/A

Name of Public Authority: N/A

Date of This Report to Archdiocese: 4/28/05

Reported to Archdiocese by: REDACTED

Alleged Victim: her son

Current Address:

Telephone: REDACTED

Date of Birth

Alleged Perpetrator:

Name Fr. Michael Wempe

Names of Possible Witnesses:

Reported Date of Incident:

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s): Fr. Wempe was the pastor at their Parish

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect: Sexual

Comments: Mother reports that her son, now 25 years old has always been a very angry person and has been in trouble on occasion. He has had some counseling and the therapists have always asked if had ever been sexually molested, something he did not admit at the time. Now her son says he is remembering several incidents. REDACTED related some of her personal circumstances and has now decided that the best thing to do is to let her son call us directly. She will ask him to do that. I asked REDACTED to please follow up with us to make sure her son does call us. We are not to call her at home. REDACTED has another son, now thirty, who has not denied being molested but has emphatically stated he does not want to talk about it. A complete report will be prepared when we have the information from the son. I assured REDACTED that we would provide counseling for her son if he wishes and also asked her if she thought she might benefit from some counseling herself. At this time she said no, but the door was left open in case she changes her mind.

254760



**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM**

Date of This Report to Public Authority: N/A

Name of Public Authority: N/A

Date of This Report to Archdiocese: 4/28/05

Reported to Archdiocese by: REDACTED

Alleged Victim: her son

Current Address:

Telephone: REDACTED

Date of Birth

Alleged Perpetrator:

Name Fr. Michael Wempe

Names of Possible Witnesses:

Reported Date of Incident:

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s): Fr. Wempe was the pastor at their Parish

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect: Sexual

Comments: Mother reports that her son, now ^{REDACTED} years old has always been a very angry person and has been in trouble on occasion. He has had some counseling and the therapists have always asked if had ever been sexually molested, something he did not admit at the time. Now her son says he is remembering several incidents. REDACTED related some of her personal circumstances and has now decided that the best thing to do is to let her son call us directly. She will ask him to do that. I asked REDACTED to please follow up with us to make sure her son does call us. We are not to call her at home. REDACTED has another son, now thirty, who has not denied being molested but has emphatically stated he does not want to talk about it. A complete report will be prepared when we have the information from the son. I assured REDACTED that we would provide counseling for her son if he wishes and also asked her if she thought she might benefit from some counseling herself. At this time she said no, but the door was left open in case she changes her mind.

254752



CONGREGATIO
PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

00120 Città del Vaticano,
Palazzo del S. Ufficio

13 June 2005

659/2004 – 21302
PROT. N.
(In responsione fiat mentio huius numeri)

CONFIDENTIAL

Your Eminence,

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith received on 27 November 2004 the case regarding the alleged sexual abuse of a minor by **Reverend Michael Edwin WEMPE**, a priest of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Your Eminence submitted a summary of the case and indicated that you would forward the evidence under separate cover.

We write at this time to request the complete *Acta* of the case. Though written summaries are helpful, actual documents are necessary in order for the Congregation to examine the case. Each element of the summary that you have already submitted should be supported by the relevant documentation either in the original form or in an authentic copy.

In addition to the requested information, it would also be important to the Congregation to have your *Votum* in the matter as this is essential in our study of the case.

With prayerful support and best wishes, I remain

Yours sincerely in Christ,

✠ Angelo AMATO, SDB
Titular Archbishop of Sila
Secretary

His Eminence
Roger Cardinal MAHONY
Archbishop of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90010-2202
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

104925

**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM**

Date of this report to Public Authority:

Name of Public Authority:

Date of this Report to Archdiocese:

June 27, 2005

Reported to Archdiocese by:

REDACTED

Complainant Name:

Current Address:

Telephone:

Date of Birth:

Alleged Perpetrator:

Fr. Michael Wempe

Name: (Victim)

REDACTED

Name of Possible Witness:

Brother (also a victim – more happened to him)

Reported Date of Incident: (s)

“1985 or 86 or 87 at St. Sebastian Church in Santa Paula”

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s):

“There was one incident of molestation. He (Wempe) was touching my naked body. There was touching of genitals & oral sex. He did things to my brother who was older. He was an altar boy. REDACTED and some friends introduced us to Fr. Wempe.”
Sexual abuse of a minor under 14 years

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect:

Comments:

Submitted by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles:

REDACTED
REDACTED

254754

INTERNAL REPORT - CONFIDENTIAL

Archdiocese of Los Angeles
Assistance Ministry Department

Report date: 6/27/05

From: Sr REDACTED

Alleged perpetrator: [REDACTED]

REDACTED

Alleged victim:

Date of incident: 1985 or 86

Brief Description REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

Type of Report:

☐ Mandatory

☐ Non-Mandatory

☐ Anonymous reporter

☐ Third-party reporting

☐ Incomplete information

☐ Attached information

Report sent to:

X

REDACTED

Chair – Clergy Misconduct Oversight Board

(Priests, Deacons, Brothers)

—

REDACTED

Vicar for Women Religious

(All women religious)

—

REDACTED

_____, Superintendent Secondary Schools

(Secondary Schools)

X

Msgr. Craig Cox, Vicar for Clergy

(Priests, Deacons, Brothers)

X

REDACTED

General Counsel

(All reports)

—

REDACTED

Director – Human Resources

(Schools, ACC, Cemetery employees)

—

REDACTED

Superintendent Elementary Schools

(Elementary Schools)

—

REDACTED

Assistance Ministry

(All reports)

—

REDACTED

Director – Religious Education

(CCD and RCIA)

254753

CCI 003463

**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM**

Date of this report to Public Authority:
Name of Public Authority:

July 5, 2005 – victim report

Det REDACTED

Parent report 4/21/02

Victim reported June 27, 2005

Date of this Report to Archdiocese:

Reported to Archdiocese by:

REDACTED

Complainant Name:

Current Address:

Telephone:

Date of Birth:

Alleged Perpetrator:

Fr. Michael Wempe

Name: (Victim)

REDACTED

Name of Possible Witness:

Reported Date of Incident: (s)

“1985 or 86 or 87” at St. Sebastian Church
in Santa Paula

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s):

REDACTED

1 said. “There was one incident of
molestation. He (Wempe) was touching my
naked body. There was touching of genitals
& oral sex. He did things to my brother who
was older. He was an altar boy. REDACTED
and some friends introduced us to Fr.
Wempe.”

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect

Sexual abuse.

Comments:

REDACTED called
4/21/02. She said that she thought her sons
had been molested by Wempe. We asked
her to have them call us. 4/28/05 Mother
called again. Requested sons to call.
6/27/05 REDACTED called for the first time to
report his abuse. He was asked to have his
brother call us.

Submitted by the Archdiocese of Los
Angeles:

REDACTED

REDACTED

254750

Msgr Cox

INTERNAL REPORT - CONFIDENTIAL

(6) 7/5/05 Archdiocese of Los Angeles
 Assistance Ministry Department
 Report date: 6/27/2005 (A) Revised From: REDACTED

Alleged perpetrator: [REDACTED]
 Alleged victim: REDACTED

Date of incident: 1985-'86 or 87

Brief Description:

Type of Report:

☐ Mandatory ☒ Non-Mandatory ☐ Anonymous reporter
☐ Third-party reporting ☐ Incomplete information ☐ Attached information

Report sent to:

☒ REDACTED - Clergy Misconduct Oversight Board
 (Priests, Deacons, Brothers)

☐ REDACTED Vicar for Women Religious
 (All women religious)

☐ REDACTED Superintendent Secondary Schools
 (Secondary Schools)

☒ Msgr. Craig Cox, Vicar for Clergy
 (Priests, Deacons, Brothers)

☒ REDACTED General Counsel
 (All reports)

☐ REDACTED Director - Human Resources
 (Schools, ACC, Cemetery employees)

☐ REDACTED Superintendent Elementary Schools
 (Elementary Schools)

☐ REDACTED Assistance Ministry
 (All reports)

☐ REDACTED Director - Religious Education
 (CCD and RCIA)

See
 attached
 history
 Revised

254749

POS-015

<p>ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED Drive</p> <p>TELEPHONE NO.: REDACTED FAX NO. (Optional): REDACTED</p> <p>E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): REDACTED</p> <p>ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">FOR COURT USE ONLY</p> <p style="font-size: 2em; transform: rotate(-15deg); opacity: 0.5;">WEMKE</p>
<p>SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Los Angeles</p> <p>STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street</p> <p>MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street</p> <p>CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 90012</p> <p>BRANCH NAME: Central District</p>	
<p>PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: REDACTED</p> <p>DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">NOTICE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT—CIVIL</p>	
<p>CASE NUMBER: BC336272</p>	

TO (insert name of party being served): THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES

NOTICE

The summons and other documents identified below are being served pursuant to section 415.30 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Your failure to complete this form and return it within 20 days from the date of mailing shown below may subject you (or the party on whose behalf you are being served) to liability for the payment of any expenses incurred in serving a summons on you in any other manner permitted by law.

If you are being served on behalf of a corporation, an unincorporated association (including a partnership), or other entity, this form must be signed by you in the name of such entity or by a person authorized to receive service of process on behalf of such entity. In all other cases, this form must be signed by you personally or by a person authorized by you to acknowledge receipt of summons. If you return this form to the sender, service of a summons is deemed complete on the day you sign the acknowledgment of receipt below.

Date of mailing: July 13, 2005 **REDACTED**

REDACTED
 (TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT

This acknowledges receipt of (to be completed by sender before mailing):

1. ☐ A copy of the summons and of the complaint.
2. ☒ Other: (specify): Summons, Complaint, Notice of Case Assignment

REDACTED

(To be completed by recipient):
 Date this form is signed: 21/7/05
 (TYPE OR PRINT YOUR NAME AND NAME OF ENTITY, IF ANY, ON WHOSE BEHALF THIS FORM IS SIGNED)

(SIGNATURE OF PERSON ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT, WITH TITLE IF ACKNOWLEDGMENT IS MADE ON BEHALF OF ANOTHER PERSON OR ENTITY)

POS-015

REDACTED		FOR COURT USE ONLY
REDACTED		
TELEPHONE NO.: REDACTED	FAX NO. (Optional): REDACTED	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): REDACTED		
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Los Angeles		
STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street		
MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street		
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 90012		
BRANCH NAME: Central District		
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: REDACTED		
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL.		
NOTICE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT—CIVIL		CASE NUMBER: BC336272

TO (insert name of party being served): ST. SEBASTIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

NOTICE

The summons and other documents identified below are being served pursuant to section 415.30 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Your failure to complete this form and return it within 20 days from the date of mailing shown below may subject you (or the party on whose behalf you are being served) to liability for the payment of any expenses incurred in serving a summons on you in any other manner permitted by law.

If you are being served on behalf of a corporation, an unincorporated association (including a partnership), or other entity, this form must be signed by you in the name of such entity or by a person authorized to receive service of process on behalf of such entity. In all other cases, this form must be signed by you personally or by a person authorized by you to acknowledge receipt of summons. If you return this form to the sender, service of a summons is deemed complete on the day you sign the acknowledgment of receipt below.

Date of mailing: July 13, 2005

REDACTED

REDACTED

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This acknowledges receipt of (to be completed by sender before mailing):

- 1. ☐ A copy of the summons and of the complaint.
- 2. ☒ Other: (specify): Summons, Complaint, Notice of Case Assignment

REDACTED

(To be completed by recipient):

Date this form is signed:

2/17/05

(TYPE OR PRINT YOUR NAME AND NAME OF ENTITY, IF ANY, ON WHOSE BEHALF THIS FORM IS SIGNED)

POS-015

(ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): REDACTED		FOR COURT USE ONLY	
REDACTED REDACTED TELEPHONE NO.: REDACTED FAX NO. (Optional): REDACTED E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): REDACTED ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff			
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Los Angeles STREET ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street MAILING ADDRESS: 111 N. Hill Street CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles, CA 90012 BRANCH NAME: Central District			
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: REDACTED DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL.			
NOTICE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT—CIVIL		CASE NUMBER: BC336272	

TO (insert name of party being served): ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES EDUCATION & WELFARE CORPORATION

<p align="center">NOTICE</p> <p>The summons and other documents identified below are being served pursuant to section 415.30 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Your failure to complete this form and return it within 20 days from the date of mailing shown below may subject you (or the party on whose behalf you are being served) to liability for the payment of any expenses incurred in serving a summons on you in any other manner permitted by law.</p> <p>If you are being served on behalf of a corporation, an unincorporated association (including a partnership), or other entity, this form must be signed by you in the name of such entity or by a person authorized to receive service of process on behalf of such entity. In all other cases, this form must be signed by you personally or by a person authorized by you to acknowledge receipt of summons. If you return this form to the sender, service of a summons is deemed complete on the day you sign the acknowledgment of receipt below.</p>
--

Date of mailing: July 13, 2005

REDACTED

REDACTED
REDACTED

(SIGNATURE OF SENDER—MUST NOT BE A PARTY IN THIS CASE)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT

This acknowledges receipt of (to be completed by sender before mailing):

- ☐ A copy of the summons and of the complaint.
- ☒ Other: (specify): Summons, Complaint, Notice of Case Assignment

REDACTED

(TYPE OR PRINT YOUR NAME AND NAME OF ENTITY, IF ANY,
ON WHOSE BEHALF THIS FORM IS SIGNED)

(SIGNATURE OF PERSON ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT, WITH TITLE &
ACKNOWLEDGMENT IS MADE ON BEHALF OF ANOTHER PERSON OR ENTITY)

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use
Judicial Council of California
POS-015 (Rev. January 1, 2005)

NOTICE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT — CIVIL

Legal
Solutions
& Plus

Page 1 of 1
Code of Civil Procedure,
§ 415.30, 1/1/00

254831

CCI 003468

SUMMONS ON COMPLAINT (CITACION JUDICIAL)

SUM-100

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT:**(AVISO AL DEMANDADO):**

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES; ST. SEBASTIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH; ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES EDUCATION & WELFARE CORPORATION; MICHAEL WEMPE; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:**(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):**

REDACTED

FOR COURT USE ONLY
(SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia. Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales.

The name and address of the court is:

(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):

Los Angeles Superior Court
111 N. Hill Street
111 N. Hill Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Central District

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

DATE:

(Fecha)

JUL 08 2008

John A. Clarke

Clerk, by

(Secretario)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citación use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served

1. ☐ as an individual defendant.
2. ☐ as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):

3. ☐ on behalf of (specify):

- | | | |
|--------|--|---|
| under: | <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.10 (corporation) | <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.60 (minor) |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) | <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.70 (conservatee) |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) | <input type="checkbox"/> CCP 416.90 (authorized person) |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> other (specify): | |

4. ☐ by personal delivery on (date):



Form Adopted for Mandatory Use
Judicial Council of California
SUM-100 [Rev. January 1, 2004]

SUMMONS

Legal
Solutions
& PlusPage 1 of 1
Code of Civil Procedure §§ 412.20, 465

254832

CCI 003469

**NOTICE OF CASE ASSIGNMENT
LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT**

BC336272

CASE NUMBER _____

THIS FORM IS TO BE SERVED WITH THE SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

Your case is assigned for all purposes to the judicial officer indicated below. There is additional information on the reverse side of this form.

ASSIGNED JUDGE	DEPT	ROOM	ASSIGNED JUDGE	DEPT	ROOM
Hon. Gregory Alarcon	36	410	Hon. William F. Fahey	78	730
Hon. Helen I. Bendix	18	308	Hon. Michael L. Stern	62	600
Hon. Elihu M. Berle	42	416	Hon. Jane Johnson	56	514
Hon. Soussan Bruguera	71	729	Hon. Morris B. Jones	48	506
Hon. Susan Bryant-Deason	52	510	Hon. Conrad Aragon	49	509
Hon. Terry Green	14	300	Hon. Maureen Duffy-Lewis	38	412
Hon. James C. Chalfant	13	630	Hon. Malcolm H. Mackey	55	515
Hon. Judith C. Chirlin	89	532	Hon. Jon M. Mayeda	72	731
Hon. Rolf M. Treu	58	516	Hon. David L. Minning	61	632
Hon. John Shepard Wiley, Jr	50	508	Hon. Victoria Chaney	324	CCW X
Hon. Ralph W. Dau	57	517	Hon. Aurelio Munoz	47	507
Hon. James R. Dunn	26	316	Hon. Mary Ann Murphy	25	317
Hon. Lee Edmon	68	617	Hon. Rodney E. Nelson	46	500
Hon. Irving Faffer	51	511	Hon. Victor H. Person	39	415
Hon. Edward A. Ferns	69	621	Hon. Mel Recana	45	529
Hon. Joanne O'Donnell	37	413	Hon. Andria K. Richey	31	407
Hon. Kenneth R. Freeman	64	601	Hon. Alice E. Altoon	28	318
Hon. Haley J. Fromholz	20	310	Hon. John P. Shook	53	513
Hon. Richard Fruin	15	307	Hon. Ronald M. Sohigian	41	417
Hon. Elizabeth A. Grimes	30	400	Hon. Rita Miller	16	306
Hon. Paul Gutman	34	408	Hon. Tricia Ann Bigelow	23	315
Hon. Teresa Sanchez-Gordon	74	735		35	411
Hon. Robert L. Hess	24	314	Hon. David A. Workman	40	414
Hon. William Highberger	32	406	Hon. George Wu	33	409
Hon. Ernest Hiroshige	54	512	Hon. Mary Thornton House	17	313
	3	224	OTHER		

Given to Plaintiff of record on _____

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk

_____, DEPUTY CLERK

Revised 01/01/05

254833

CCI 003470

REDACTED

COPY

REDACTED

UNFORMED COPY
OF ORIGINAL FILED
Los Angeles Superior Court

JUL 08 2005

John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk
By D. GILES Deputy

Attorneys for Plaintiff
6 REDACTED

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL COURT

BC336272

REDACTED

10 REDACTED)
11)
12 Plaintiff,)
13)
14 v.)
15 THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP)
16 OF LOS ANGELES; ST. SEBASTIAN)
17 CATHOLIC CHURCH; ARCHDIOCESE OF)
18 LOS ANGELES EDUCATION & WELFARE)
19 CORPORATION; MICHAEL WEMPE; and)
20 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive.)
21)
22 Defendants.)
23)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

CASE NO.

COMPLAINT FOR:

1. CHILDHOOD SEXUAL ABUSE;
2. NEGLIGENCE;
3. NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION;
4. NEGLIGENT HIRING/RETENTION;
5. FRAUD;
6. FIDUCIARY/CONF. RELATIONSHIP FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY;
7. BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY;
8. NEGLIGENT FAILURE TO WARN, TRAIN, OR EDUCATE PLAINTIFFS;
9. INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS;
10. VIOLATION OF PENAL CODE § 32;
11. VIOLATION OF PENAL CODE § 11166;
12. VIOLATION OF PENAL CODE §§ 273a(a), (b);
13. RESERVED;
14. NEGLIGENCE PER SE FOR STATUTORY VIOLATIONS;
15. RESERVED;
16. FRAUD AND DECEIT;
17. PREMISES LIABILITY;
18. RESERVED.

[Demand for Jury Trial]

1 Based upon information and belief available to Plaintiff at the time of the filing of this
2 Complaint, Plaintiff makes the following allegations:

3 **PARTIES**

4 1. Plaintiff REDACTED ("Plaintiff") is an adult male. Plaintiff was a minor at the time
5 of the sexual abuse alleged herein.

6 2. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles (the "Archdiocese") is a corporation sole,
7 authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of California, with its principal
8 place of business in Los Angeles, California. The Archdiocese has responsibility for Roman Catholic
9 Church operations in Los Angeles, Ventura, and Santa Barbara Counties, California. The Archdiocese
10 is the archdiocese that employed Michael Wempe at the time he abused Plaintiff.

REDACTED

11 2.1 St. Sebastian Catholic Church ("St. Sebastian") is a Roman Catholic school and/or parish
12 located in Santa Paula, California. St. Sebastian is the parish that employed Michael Wempe at the
13 time he abused Plaintiff.

14 2.1.a. Archdiocese of Los Angeles Education & Welfare Corporation (the "Archdiocese Education
15 Corporation") is a non-profit corporation authorized to conduct business and conducting business in
16 the State of California, with its principal place of business in Los Angeles, California. Plaintiff is
17 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant Archdiocese Education Corporation
18 owned and/or controlled St. Sebastian at all times relevant.

19 2.3 RESERVED.

20 2.4 Michael Wempe ("Wempe"), was at all times relevant an ordained priest in the Roman
21 Catholic Church. Wempe sexually abused Plaintiff. During the dates of abuse, Wempe was a
22 practicing priest assigned to the Archdiocese, St. Sebastian, the Archdiocese Education Corporation,
23 and Does 1 through 100, and was under the direct supervision, employ and control of the Archdiocese,
24 St. Sebastian, the Archdiocese Education Corporation, and Does 1 through 100.

25 3. Defendant Does 1 through 100, inclusive, are individuals and/or business or corporate
26 entities incorporated in and or doing business in California whose true names and capacities are
27 unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such defendants by such fictitious names, and who will
28 amend the Complaint to show the true names and capacities of each such Doe defendant when

Law Offices of

REDACTED

1 ascertained. Each such Defendant Doe is legally responsible in some manner for the events,
 2 happenings and/or tortious and unlawful conduct that caused the injuries and damages alleged in this
 3 Complaint. The Archdiocese, St. Sebastian, the Archdiocese Education Corporation, Wempe, and
 4 Does 1 through 100 are some times hereinafter referred to as the "Defendants."

5 4. Each Defendant is the agent, servant and/or employee of other Defendants, and each
 6 Defendant was acting within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as an agent, servant and/or
 7 employee of the other Defendants. Defendants, and each of them, are individuals, corporations,
 8 partnerships and other entities which engaged in, joined in and conspired with the other wrongdoers
 9 in carrying out the tortious and unlawful activities described in this Complaint, and Defendants, and
 10 each of them, ratified the acts of the other Defendants as described in this Complaint.

11 BACKGROUND FACTS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

12 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Wempe, while he was an
 13 ordained priest, was at all times mentioned herein an agent, employee, or servant of the Defendants,
 14 and/or was under the jurisdiction and control of the Defendants. Specifically, Plaintiff is informed and
 15 believes, and on that basis alleges, the following:

16 A. On or about April 30, 1966, Wempe was ordained a priest. At that time, Wempe
 17 was incardinated in the Archdiocese.

18 B. On or about May 14, 1966, Wempe was assigned to St. John Chrysostom,
 19 Inglewood.

20 C. On or about March 25, 1969, Wempe was assigned to St. Andrew, Pasadena.

21 D. On or about September 2, 1969, Wempe was assigned to St. Rose of Lima, Simi
 22 Valley.

23 E. On or about June 11, 1973, Wempe was assigned to St. Jude, Westlake Village.

24 F. On or about June 17, 1977, Wempe was assigned to Sacred Heart, Ventura.

25 G. On or about February 20, 1978, Wempe was assigned to teach at Paraclete High
 26 School, Lancaster, with his residence at St. Mary Church, Palmdale.

27 H. On or about July 12, 1984, Wempe was assigned to St. Sebastian, a Catholic church
 28 and school in Santa Paula, California, owned by and/or under the jurisdiction and control of the

Law Offices of

REDACTED

1 Archdiocese and/or the Archdiocese Education Corporation, where he was an employee, agent, and/or
 2 servant of the Archdiocese and/or the Archdiocese Education Corporation.

3 I. On or about September 1, 1986, Wempe went on sabbatical to Vatican II Institute,
 4 Menlo Park.

5 J. On or about February 1, 1987, Wempe was assigned as administrator pro tem of St.
 6 Sebastian, a Catholic church and school in Santa Paula, California, owned by and/or under the
 7 jurisdiction and control of the Archdiocese and/or the Archdiocese Education Corporation, where he
 8 was an employee, agent, and/or servant of the Archdiocese and/or the Archdiocese Education
 9 Corporation.

10 K. On or about June 22, 1987, Wempe was assigned to Foundation House, Servants
 11 of the Paraclete, Jemez Springs, New Mexico, a treatment center for pedophile priests.

12 L. On or about January 18, 1988, Wempe was assigned to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center
 13 as chaplain, and assigned to live at St. Ambrose, West Hollywood.

14 M. On or about October 15, 1998, Wempe continued as chaplain at Cedars-Sinai, but
 15 was assigned to live at Immaculate Heart of Mary, Los Angeles.

16 N. On or about February 1, 2002, Wempe continued as chaplain at Cedars-Sinai, but
 17 was assigned to live at Cathedral Chapel, Los Angeles.

18 O. In 2002, Wempe was granted early retirement.

19 P. Wempe is currently being prosecuted for child molestation.

20 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Wempe molested minor
 21 parishioners and/or students from parishes and/or schools owned, operated, and controlled by the
 22 Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants were aware
 23 of, had notice of, and should have known, of the molestations by Wempe. For example, Plaintiff is
 24 informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, the following:

25 A. Employees, agents, and or persons under the jurisdiction and control of Defendants
 26 saw boys going to Wempe's bedroom with him.

27 B. Employees, agents, and or persons under the jurisdiction and control of Defendants
 28 knew that boys were spending the night in Wempe's bedroom with him.

Law Offices of

REDACTED

1 C. Parents complained to employees, agents, and/or persons under the jurisdiction and
2 control of Defendants about Wempe's activities with children.

3 D. Wempe was moved from St. Andrew, Pasadena within six months of having been
4 assigned there. Plaintiff is informed and believes that a priest being removed from a parish so quickly
5 is typically a response to complaints about that priest.

6 E. Wempe was moved from Sacred Heart, Ventura, six months after having been
7 assigned there, and was sent to live in Palmdale. Plaintiff is informed and believes that a priest being
8 removed from a parish so quickly is typically a response to complaints about that priest.

9 F. The employees, agents, and/or persons under the jurisdiction and control of
10 Defendants were aware that Wempe had an unusual interest in minor boys, and had frequent
11 unsupervised contact with children for extended periods of time.

12 G. Many of the minor boys who were subjected to sexual abuse by Wempe reacted to
13 the abuse in ways that should have made Defendants question the circumstances and motivation of
14 Wempe's contact with minor boys. The minor boys abused and molested by Wempe were young,
15 impressionable and particularly vulnerable.

16 7. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that even though the
17 Defendants knew and should have known that Wempe had molested and sexually abused minors, and
18 even though the Defendants had actual and constructive knowledge of the molestations and sexual
19 abuses, the Defendants covered up the molestations and abuses by Wempe, continued to hold Wempe
20 out as a Catholic priest who could be trusted with minor parishioners and/or minor students, continued
21 to allow Wempe to work with minor parishioners and/or minor students on a daily basis, and
22 continued to move Wempe to different Catholic churches and/or schools within the Defendants, and
23 failed to supervise and/or monitor Wempe to ensure that he was not molesting minor parishioners and
24 students again.

25 Wempe's Abuse and Molestation of Plaintiff

26 8. Plaintiff was born on July 9, 1979, and is currently 25 years old. Plaintiff was raised in the
27 Roman Catholic Church. Plaintiff and his family were parishioners at St. Sebastian.

28

Law Offices of

REDACTED

1 9. During the time that Wempe was assigned to St. Sebastian in Santa Paula, California,
 2 Wempe sexually abused and molested Plaintiff in or about the 1980s, when Plaintiff was a minor. The
 3 acts of sexual abuse and molestation included, but were not limited to, fondling of buttocks (skin to
 4 skin), oral copulation of minor, digital anal penetration of minor, pre-sexual grooming, and other
 5 things.

6 10. RESERVED.

7 10.1 RESERVED.

8 11. As a direct result of the wrongful conduct alleged herein, Plaintiff suffered, and continues
 9 to suffer, great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional
 10 distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has
 11 suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from
 12 performing his daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and continues
 13 to sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur
 14 expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

15 11.1 RESERVED.

16 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
 17 **(Childhood Sexual Abuse)**
(Against All Defendants)

18 12. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

19 13. Wempe engaged in unpermitted, harmful and offensive sexual conduct and contact
 20 upon the person of Plaintiff. Said conduct was undertaken while Wempe was an employee, volunteer,
 21 representative, or agent of Defendants, while in the course and scope of employment with Defendants.

22 14. Prior to or during the abuse alleged above, Defendants knew, had reason to know, or were
 23 otherwise on notice of unlawful sexual conduct by Wempe. Defendants failed to take reasonable steps
 24 and failed to implement reasonable safeguards to avoid acts of unlawful sexual conduct in the future
 25 by Wempe, including, but not limited to, preventing or avoiding placement of Wempe in functions or
 26 environments in which contact with children was an inherent part of those functions or environments.
 27 Furthermore, at no time during the periods of time alleged did Defendants have in place a system or
 28

1 procedure to supervise and/or monitor employees, volunteers, representatives, or agents to insure that
2 they did not molest or abuse minors in Defendants' care, including the Plaintiff.

3 15. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
4 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
5 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
6 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
7 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
8 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
9 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

10 15.1 RESERVED.

REDACTED

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
12 **(Negligence)**
(Against All Defendants)

13 16. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

14 17. Defendants had a duty to protect the minor Plaintiff when he was entrusted to their care by
15 Plaintiff's parents. Plaintiff's care, welfare, and/or physical custody was temporarily entrusted to
16 Defendants. Defendants voluntarily accepted the entrusted care of Plaintiff. As such, Defendants
17 owed Plaintiff, a minor child, a special duty of care, in addition to a duty of ordinary care, and owed
18 Plaintiff the higher duty of care that adults dealing with children owe to protect them from harm.

19 18. Defendants, by and through their agents, servants and employees, knew or reasonably
20 should have known of Wempe's dangerous and exploitive propensities and/or that Wempe was an
21 unfit agent. It was foreseeable that if Defendants did not adequately exercise or provide the duty of
22 care owed to children in their care, including but not limited to Plaintiff, the children entrusted to
23 Defendants' care would be vulnerable to sexual abuse by Wempe.

24 19. Defendants breached their duty of care to the minor Plaintiff by allowing Wempe
25 to come into contact with the minor Plaintiff without supervision; by failing to adequately hire,
26 supervise, or retain Wempe who they permitted and enabled to have access to Plaintiff; by failing to
27 investigate or otherwise confirm or deny such facts about Wempe; by failing to tell or concealing from
28 Plaintiff, Plaintiff's parents, guardians, or law enforcement officials that Wempe was or may have been

Law Offices of

REDACTED

1 sexually abusing minors; by failing to tell or concealing from Plaintiff's parents, guardians, or law
 2 enforcement officials that Plaintiff was or may have been sexually abused after Defendants knew or
 3 had reason to know that Wempe may have sexually abused Plaintiff, thereby enabling Plaintiff to
 4 continue to be endangered and sexually abused, and/or creating the circumstance where Plaintiff was
 5 less likely to receive medical/mental health care and treatment, thus exacerbating the harm done to
 6 Plaintiff; and/or by holding out Wempe to the Plaintiff and his parents or guardians as being in good
 7 standing and trustworthy. Defendants cloaked within the facade of normalcy Defendants' and/or
 8 Wempe's contact and/or actions with the Plaintiff and/or with other minors who were victims of
 9 Wempe, and/or disguised the nature of the sexual abuse and contact.

10 20. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
 11 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
 12 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
 13 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
 14 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
 15 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity, and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
 16 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

17 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
 18 **(Negligent Supervision/failure to Warn)**
(Against All Defendants)

19 21. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

20 22. Defendants had a duty to provide reasonable supervision of Wempe; to use reasonable care
 21 in investigating Wempe; and to provide adequate warning to the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's family, minor
 22 students, and minor parishioners of Wempe's dangerous propensities and unfitness.

23 23. Defendants, by and through their agents, servants and employees, knew or reasonably
 24 should have known of Wempe's dangerous and exploitive propensities and/or that Wempe was an
 25 unfit agent. Despite such knowledge, Defendants negligently failed to supervise Wempe in the
 26 position of trust and authority as a Roman Catholic Priest, religious instructor, counselor, school
 27 administrator, school teacher, surrogate parent, spiritual mentor, emotional mentor, and/or other
 28 authority figure, where he was able to commit the wrongful acts against the Plaintiff. Defendants

Law Offices of

REDACTED

1 failed to provide reasonable supervision of Wempe, failed to use reasonable care in investigating
 2 Wempe, and failed to provide adequate warning to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family of Wempe's
 3 dangerous propensities and unfitness. Defendants further failed to take reasonable measures to prevent
 4 future sexual abuse.

5 24. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
 6 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
 7 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
 8 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
 9 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
 10 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
 11 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

12 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
 13 **(Negligent Hiring/Retention)**
(Against All Defendants)

14 25. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

15 26. Defendants had a duty to not hire and/or retain Wempe, and other employees, agents,
 16 volunteers, and other representatives, given Wempe's dangerous and exploitive propensities.

17 27. Defendants, by and through their agents, servants and employees, knew or reasonably
 18 should have known of Wempe's dangerous and exploitive propensities and/or that Wempe was an
 19 unfit agent. Despite such knowledge, Defendants negligently hired and/or retained Wempe in the
 20 position of trust and authority as a Roman Catholic Priest, religious instructor, counselor, school
 21 administrator, school teacher, surrogate parent, spiritual mentor, emotional mentor, and/or other
 22 authority figure, where he was able to commit the wrongful acts against the Plaintiff. Defendants
 23 failed to use reasonable care in investigating Wempe and failed to provide adequate warning to
 24 Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family of Wempe's dangerous propensities and unfitness. Defendants further
 25 failed to take reasonable measures to prevent future sexual abuse.

26 28. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
 27 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress.
 28 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered

1 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
 2 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
 3 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
 4 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

5 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Fraud)**

7 **(Against all Defendants)**

8 29. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

9 30. Defendants knew and/or had reason to know of the sexual misconduct of Wempe.

10 31. Defendants misrepresented, concealed or failed to disclose information relating to
 11 sexual misconduct of Wempe as described herein, and that Defendants continued to misrepresent,
 12 conceal, and fail to disclose information relating to sexual misconduct of Wempe as described herein.

13 32. Defendants knew that they misrepresented, concealed or failed to disclose information
 14 relating to sexual misconduct of Wempe.

15 33. Plaintiff justifiably relied upon Defendants for information relating to sexual misconduct
 16 of Wempe.

17 34. Defendants, with the intent to conceal and defraud, did misrepresent, conceal or fail to
 18 disclose information relating to the sexual misconduct of Wempe.

19 35. As a direct result of Defendants' fraud, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer great
 20 pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
 21 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
 22 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
 23 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
 24 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
 25 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

26 36. In addition, when Plaintiff finally discovered the fraud of Defendants, and continuing
 27 thereafter, Plaintiff experienced recurrences of the above-described injuries. In addition, when
 28 Plaintiff finally discovered the fraud of Defendants, and continuing thereafter, Plaintiff experienced
 extreme and severe mental and emotional distress that Plaintiff had been the victim of the Defendants'

REDACTED

Law Office of

1 fraud; that Plaintiff had not been able to help other minors being molested because of the fraud; and
 2 that Plaintiff had not been able because of the fraud to receive timely medical treatment needed to deal
 3 with the problems Plaintiff had suffered and continues to suffer as a result of the molestations.

4 36.1 RESERVED.

5 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
 6 **(Fiduciary/Confidential Relationship Fraud**
 7 **And Conspiracy to Commit Fraud)**
 8 **(Against All Defendants)**

9 37. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

10 38. Because of Plaintiff's young age, and because of the status of Wempe as an authority figure
 11 to Plaintiff, Plaintiff was vulnerable to Wempe. Wempe sought Plaintiff out, and was empowered by
 12 and accepted Plaintiff's vulnerability. Plaintiff's vulnerability also prevented Plaintiff from effectively
 13 protecting himself.

14 39. By holding Wempe out as a qualified Roman Catholic clergy, religious instructor,
 15 counselor, school administrator, school teacher, surrogate parent, spiritual mentor, emotional mentor,
 16 and/or other authority figure, and by undertaking the religious and/or secular instruction and spiritual
 17 and emotional counseling of Plaintiff. Defendants entered into a fiduciary and/or confidential
 18 relationship with the minor Plaintiff.

19 40. Having a fiduciary and/or confidential relationship, Defendants had the duty to obtain and
 20 disclose information relating to sexual misconduct of Wempe.

21 41. Defendants misrepresented, concealed or failed to disclose information relating to sexual
 22 misconduct of Wempe, and that Defendants continued to misrepresent, conceal, and failed to disclose
 23 information relating to sexual misconduct of Wempe as described herein.

24 42. Defendants knew that they misrepresented, concealed or failed to disclose information
 25 relating to sexual misconduct of Wempe.

26 43. Plaintiff justifiably relied upon Defendants for information relating to sexual misconduct
 27 of Wempe.

28 44. Defendants, in concert with each other and with the intent to conceal and defraud, conspired
 and came to a meeting of the minds whereby they would misrepresent, conceal or fail to disclose
 information relating to the sexual misconduct of Wempe.

Law Office of

REDACTED

1 45. By so concealing, Defendants committed at least one act in furtherance of the conspiracy.

2 46. As a direct result of Defendants' fraud and conspiracy, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues
3 to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional
4 distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has
5 suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from
6 performing Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will
7 continue to sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur
8 expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

9 47. In addition, when Plaintiff finally discovered the fraud of Defendants, and continuing
10 thereafter, Plaintiff experienced recurrences of the above-described injuries. In addition, when
11 Plaintiff finally discovered the fraud of Defendants, and continuing thereafter, Plaintiff experienced
12 extreme and severe mental and emotional distress that Plaintiff had been the victim of the Defendants'
13 fraud; that Plaintiff had not been able to help other minors being molested because of the fraud; and
14 that Plaintiff had not been able because of the fraud to receive timely medical treatment needed to deal
15 with the problems Plaintiff had suffered and continues to suffer as a result of the molestations.

16 47.1 RESERVED.

17 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
18 **(Breach of Fiduciary Duty And/or Confidential Relationship)**
(Against All Defendants)

19 48. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

20 49. Because of Plaintiff's young age, and because of the status of Wempe as an authority figure
21 to Plaintiff, Plaintiff was vulnerable to Wempe. Wempe sought Plaintiff out, and was empowered by
22 and accepted Plaintiff's vulnerability. Plaintiff's vulnerability also prevented Plaintiff from effectively
23 protecting himself.

24 50. By holding Wempe out as a qualified Roman Catholic clergy, religious, religious
25 instructor, counselor, school administrator, school teacher, surrogate parent, spiritual mentor,
26 emotional mentor, and/or any other authority figure, and by undertaking the religious and/or secular
27 instruction and spiritual and or emotional counseling of Plaintiff, Defendants entered into a fiduciary
28 and/or confidential relationship with the minor Plaintiff.

1 51. Defendants and each of them breached their fiduciary duty to Plaintiff by engaging in the
2 negligent and wrongful conduct described herein.

3 52. As a direct result of Defendants' breach of their fiduciary duty, Plaintiff has suffered, and
4 continues to suffer great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of
5 emotional distress, embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment
6 of life; has suffered and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be
7 prevented from performing Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has
8 sustained and will continue to sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and
9 will continue to incur expenses for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

10 REDACTED

10 52.1 RESERVED.

11 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
12 **(Negligent Failure to Warn, Train, or Educate Plaintiff)**
(Against All Defendants)

13 53. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

14 54. Defendants breached their duty to take reasonable protective measures to protect Plaintiff
15 and other minor parishioners and/or students from the risk of childhood sexual abuse by Wempe, such
16 as the failure to properly warn, train, or educate Plaintiff and other minor parishioners and/or students
17 about how to avoid such a risk, pursuant to Juarez v. Boy Scouts of America, Inc., 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d
18 12, 81 Cal. App. 4th 377 (2000).

19 55. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
20 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
21 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
22 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
23 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
24 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
25 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

26 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
27 **(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress)**
(Against All Defendants)

28 56. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

1 57. Defendants' conduct was extreme and outrageous and was intentional or done recklessly.

2 58. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff experienced and continues to experience severe
3 emotional distress resulting in bodily harm.

4 59. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
5 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
6 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
7 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
8 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
9 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
10 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

REDACTED

11 59.1 RESERVED.

12 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
13 **(Violation of Penal Code § 32)**
(Against All Defendants)

14 60. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

15 61. Defendants' acts described herein violate California Penal Code § 32 in that Defendants
16 harbored, concealed and/or aided Wempe after Wempe had committed a felony, with the intent that
17 Wempe might avoid or escape arrest, trial, conviction and/or punishment, and Defendants having
18 knowledge that Wempe had committed a felony.

19 62. Defendants continue to violate California Penal Code § 32 because of their continued
20 actions in harboring, concealing, and aiding Wempe.

21 63. Plaintiff was within the class of persons to be protected by Penal Code § 32.

22 64. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
23 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
24 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
25 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
26 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
27 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
28 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

1 64.1 RESERVED.

2 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
 3 **(Violation of Penal Code § 11166)**
(Against All Defendants)

4 65. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

5 66. Under the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act, Defendants, by and through their
 6 employees and agents, were "child care custodians" and were "clergy members" under a statutory duty
 7 to report known or suspected incidences of sexual molestation or abuse of minors to a child protective
 8 agency, pursuant to California Penal Code § 11164.

9 67. Defendants knew, or should have known in the exercise of reasonable diligence, that
 10 Wempe had sexually molested, abused, or caused touching, battery, harm and other injuries to
 11 Plaintiff, who was a minor, and to other minors, giving rise to a duty to report such conduct under
 12 § 11166 of the California Penal Code.

13 68. By failing to report the continuing molestations known by Defendants, and each of them,
 14 and by ignoring the fulfillment of the mandated compliance with the reporting requirements provided
 15 under California Penal Code § 11166, Defendants created the risk and danger contemplated by the
 16 Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act, and as a result, unreasonably and wrongfully exposed
 17 Plaintiff and other minors to the molestation as alleged herein, thereby breaching Defendants' duty of
 18 care to Plaintiff.

19 69. Plaintiff was of the class of persons for whose protection California Penal Code § 11166
 20 was specifically adopted to protect.

21 70. Had Defendants adequately performed their duties under § 11166 of the California Penal
 22 Code, and reported the molestation of Plaintiff and other minors, the report would have resulted in the
 23 involvement of trained child sexual abuse case workers for the purposes of preventing harm and
 24 further harm to Plaintiff and other minors, and preventing and/or treating the injuries and damages
 25 suffered by Plaintiff as alleged herein.

26 71. As a proximate result of Defendants' failure to follow the mandatory reporting requirements
 27 of California Penal Code § 11166, the Defendants wrongfully denied and restricted Plaintiff and other
 28 minors from the protection of child protection agencies which would have changed the then-existing

Law Offices of

REDACTED

1 arrangements and conditions, which provided the access and opportunities for the molestation of
2 Plaintiff.

3 72. The physical, mental, and emotional damages and injuries resulting from the sexual
4 molestation of Plaintiff alleged herein, were the types of occurrences and injuries the Child Abuse and
5 Neglect Reporting Act was designed to prevent.

6 73. Defendants continue to violate these statutory sections because of their continued failure
7 to report the abuse known to them.

8 74. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
9 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
10 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
11 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
12 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
13 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
14 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

15 74.1 RESERVED.

16 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
17 **(Violation of Penal Code §§ 273a(a), (b))**
(Against All Defendants)

18 75. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

19 76. Under circumstances or conditions likely to produce great bodily harm or death, the
20 Defendants willfully caused or permitted the Plaintiff to suffer, or inflicted thereon unjustifiable
21 physical pain or mental suffering, or having the care or custody of the Plaintiff, willfully caused or
22 permitted the person or health of the Plaintiff to be injured, or willfully caused or permitted the
23 Plaintiff to be placed in a situation where the Plaintiff's person or health was endangered, in violation
24 of California Penal Code § 273a(a).

25 77. Under circumstances or conditions other than those likely to produce great bodily harm
26 or death, the Defendants willfully caused or permitted the Plaintiff to suffer, or inflicted thereon
27 unjustifiable physical pain or mental suffering, or having the care or custody of the Plaintiff, willfully
28 caused or permitted the person or health of the Plaintiff to be injured, or willfully caused or permitted

Law Offices of

REDACTED

1 the Plaintiff to be placed in a situation where the Plaintiff's person or health may be endangered, in
2 violation of California Penal Code § 273a(b).

3 78. Plaintiff was within the class of persons to be protected by Penal Code §§ 273a(a), (b).

4 79. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
5 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
6 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
7 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
8 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
9 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
10 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

REDACTED

11 79.1 RESERVED.

12 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
(Reserved)

13 80. RESERVED.

14 81. RESERVED.

15 82. RESERVED.

16 83. RESERVED.

17 84. RESERVED.

18 85. RESERVED.

19 86. RESERVED.

20 87. RESERVED.

21 88. RESERVED.

22 89. RESERVED.

23 90. RESERVED.

24 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
(Negligence Per Se for Statutory Violations)
(Against All Defendants)

25 91. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

26 92. At all times or sometimes herein mentioned, there was in full force and effect Penal Code
27
28

1 §§ 32; 11166; 273a; 266j; 285; 286(b)(1) & (2); 286(c); 288(a) & (b); 288a(b)(1) & (2); 288a(c);
 2 289(h), (i) & (j); 647.6; or any prior laws of California of similar effect at the time these acts described
 3 herein were committed. These laws made unlawful certain acts relating to the sexual abuse of minors.

4 93. At the times mentioned herein, Defendants were in violation of the aforesaid statutes in
 5 doing the acts set forth herein.

6 94. Plaintiff was within the class of persons to be protected by Penal Code §§ 32; 11166;
 7 273a; 266j; 285; 286(b)(1) & (2); 286(c); 288(a) & (b); 288a(b)(1) & (2); 288a(c); 289(h), (i) & (j);
 8 647.6; or any prior laws of California of similar effect at the time these acts described herein were
 9 committed.

REDACTED 10 95. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
 11 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
 12 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
 13 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
 14 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
 15 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
 16 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

17 **FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
 (Reserved)

18 96. RESERVED.

19 97. RESERVED.

20 98. RESERVED.

21 99. RESERVED.

22 100. RESERVED.

23 101. RESERVED.

24 102. RESERVED.

25 **SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
 (Fraud and Deceit)
 (Against all Defendants)

26 103. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

27 104. Wempe held himself out to Plaintiff as a Roman Catholic Priest, religious

Law Offices of

REDACTED

1 instructor, counselor, school administrator, school teacher, surrogate parent, spiritual mentor,
 2 emotional mentor, and/or other authority figure. Wempe represented to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's parents
 3 that he would counsel and guide Plaintiff with his educational, spiritual, and emotional needs. 105.

4 These representations were made by Wempe with the intent and for the purpose of
 5 inducing Plaintiff and Plaintiff's parents to entrust the educational, spiritual and physical well being
 6 of Plaintiff with Wempe.

7 106. Wempe misrepresented, concealed or failed to disclose information relating to his
 8 true intentions to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's parents when they entrusted Plaintiff to his care, which were
 9 to sexually molest and abuse Plaintiff. Plaintiff justifiably relied upon Wempe's representations.

10 107. Wempe was an employee, agent, and/or representative of Defendants. At the time
 11 he fraudulently induced Plaintiff and Plaintiff's parents to entrust the care and physical welfare of
 12 Plaintiff to Wempe, Wempe was acting within the course and scope of his employment with
 13 Defendants.

14 108. Defendants are vicariously liable for the fraud and deceit of Wempe.

15 109. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
 16 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
 17 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
 18 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
 19 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
 20 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
 21 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

22 110. In addition, when Plaintiff finally discovered the fraud of Defendants, and continuing
 23 thereafter, Plaintiff experienced recurrences of the above-described injuries. In addition, when
 24 Plaintiff finally discovered the fraud of Defendants, and continuing thereafter, Plaintiff experienced
 25 extreme and severe mental and emotional distress that Plaintiff had been the victim of the Defendants'
 26 fraud; that Plaintiff had not been able to help other minors being molested because of the fraud; and
 27 that Plaintiff had not been able because of the fraud to receive timely medical treatment needed to deal
 28 with the problems Plaintiff had suffered and continues to suffer as a result of the molestations.

1 110.1 RESERVED.

2 **SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
 3 **(Premises Liability)**
 4 **(Against All Defendants)**

5 111. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

6 112. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were in possession of the property where the Plaintiff was groomed and assaulted by Wempe, and had the right to manage, use and control that property.

7 113. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants knew that Wempe had a history of committing sexual assaults against children, and that any child at, among other locations, schools and parishes owned by and under the jurisdiction and control of Defendants, was at risk to be sexually assaulted by Wempe.

REDACTED

11 114. Defendants knew or should have known that, among other locations, schools and parishes owned by and under the jurisdiction and control of Defendants had a history of sexual assaults against children committed by Wempe and that any child at, among other locations, schools and parishes owned by and under the jurisdiction and control of Defendants, was at risk to be sexually assaulted. It was foreseeable to Defendants that Wempe would sexually assault children if they continued to allow Wempe to teach, supervise, instruct, care for, and have custody and control of and/or contact with children.

18 115. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants knew or should have known Wempe was repeatedly committing sexual assaults against children.

20 116. It was foreseeable to Defendants that the sexual assaults being committed by Wempe would continue if Defendants continued to allow Wempe to teach, supervise, instruct, care for, and have custody of and/or contact with young children.

23 117. Because it was foreseeable that the sexual assaults being committed by Wempe would continue if Defendants continued to allow him to teach, supervise, instruct, care for, and have custody of and/or contact with young children, Defendants owed a duty of care to all children, including Plaintiff, exposed to Wempe. Defendants also owed a heightened duty of care to all children, including Plaintiff, because of their young age.

28

REDACTED

1 118. By allowing Wempe to teach, supervise, instruct, care for, and have custody of and/or
 2 contact with young children, and by failing to warn children and their families of the threat posed by
 3 Wempe, Defendants breached their duty of care to all children, including Plaintiff.

4 119. Defendants negligently used and managed, among other locations, schools and parishes
 5 owned by and under the jurisdiction and control of Defendants, and created a dangerous condition and
 6 an unreasonable risk of harm to children by allowing Wempe to teach, supervise, instruct, care for and
 7 have custody of and/or contact with young children at, among other locations, schools and parishes
 8 owned by and under the jurisdiction and control of Defendants.

9 120. As a result of the dangerous conditions created by Defendants, numerous children were
 10 sexually assaulted by Wempe.

11 121. The dangerous conditions created by Defendants were the proximate cause of Plaintiff's
 12 injuries and damages.

13 122. As a result of these dangerous conditions, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer
 14 great pain of mind and body, shock, emotional distress, physical manifestations of emotional distress,
 15 embarrassment, loss of self-esteem, disgrace, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life; has suffered
 16 and continues to suffer spiritually; was prevented and will continue to be prevented from performing
 17 Plaintiff's daily activities and obtaining the full enjoyment of life; has sustained and will continue to
 18 sustain loss of earnings and earning capacity; and/or has incurred and will continue to incur expenses
 19 for medical and psychological treatment, therapy, and counseling.

20 **EIGHTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
 (Reserved)

21 123. RESERVED.

22 124. RESERVED.

23 125. RESERVED.

24 125.1 RESERVED.

25

26 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for damages, costs, interest, attorneys' fees, statutory/civil penalties
 27 according to law; and such other relief as the court deems appropriate and just.

28

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

DATE: July 7, 2005

LAW OFFICES OF REDACTED

REDACTED

By:

Law Offices of

REDACTED

01/17/06 13:33:22 Via Fax

-> INTUITY..FAX

REDACTED

Confirming Page 001



MEMORANDUM

TO: Presbyterate of the Archdiocese

FROM: Monsignor Craig A. Cox, Vicar for Clergy

RE: Keeping You Informed

DATE: 17 January 2006

The criminal trial of Reverend Michael Wempe begins today. As the trial progresses, we expect that there will be media attention given to the testimony and the results of the trial. I wanted to give you this notice in advance.

Please keep everyone involved in the trial in your prayers.

254900

** TOTAL PAGE.02 **



MEMORANDUM

TO: Presbyterate of the Archdiocese

FROM: Monsignor Craig A. Cox, Vicar for Clergy

RE: Keeping You Informed

DATE: 22 February 2006

Earlier today, the jury in the criminal trial of Reverend Michael Wempe reached the verdict of "Guilty" on the fifth of the five criminal counts lodged against him. The jury was unable to reach a verdict on the other four counts.

Below please find the statement issued by the Archdiocese in response to this verdict.

STATEMENT OF ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES ON CONVICTION OF FATHER MICHAEL WEMPE

Father Michael Wempe's conviction cannot restore the trust and innocence stolen from his victims, but hopefully this verdict may provide them some measure of justice and comfort.

To those he abused, we again apologize, and we assure them of our support and of our firm resolve to continue to employ effective means of preventing all forms of abuse in our church.

We believed Father Wempe's treatment had been successful. Today, a priest credibly accused of abuse is permanently removed from ministry. At the same time, abuse prevention programs in all of our parishes and schools equip parents and guardians with the skills to spot behavior that can lead to abuse and to report such behavior before abuse can take place.

Please pray for those people who were harmed by Father Wempe as well as for all victims of sexual abuse.

02/22/06 15:45:59 Via Fax

->

REDACTED REDACTED

Page 002

PRESS



RELEASE

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

REDACTED

3424
Wilshire
BoulevardLos Angeles
California
90010-2748**CONTACT:**

REDACTED

Office: REDACTED

Home:

REDACTED

FOR: IMMEDIATE RELEASE**FEBRUARY 22, 2006****STATEMENT OF ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
ON CONVICTION OF FATHER MICHAEL WEMPE**

Father Michael Wempe's conviction cannot restore the trust and innocence stolen from his victims, but hopefully this verdict may provide them some measure of justice and comfort.

To those he abused, we again apologize, and we assure them of our support and of our firm resolve to continue to employ effective means of preventing all forms of abuse in our church.

We believed Father Wempe's treatment had been successful. Today, a priest credibly accused of abuse is permanently removed from ministry. At the same time, abuse prevention programs in all of our parishes and schools equip parents and guardians with the skills to spot behavior that can lead to abuse and to report such behavior before abuse can take place.

#####

REDACTED

Let's talk about this - I see
Two issues: 1) if info becomes public
before he's told; 2) will he want to
celebrate Mom for his mother upon release.

REDACTED

254891

CCI 003496

**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY**

Date of this report to Public Authority:

Name of Public Authority:

Date of this Report to Archdiocese: 12/17/2007

Reported to Archdiocese by: REDACTED

Alleged Victim:

Current Address: REDACTED

Telephone: REDACTED

Date of Birth:

Alleged Perpetrator: Fr. Michael Wempe

Reported Date of Incident (s) 1969 or 1970

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s): "My parents were getting a divorce & I went to Fr Michael for help at the rectory. He said, 'Let's go talk' and we went for a ride in his car to the drive in theatre. He slapped me around then had oral and anal sex with me. I later told the police and a teacher but no one ever did anything."

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect: Sexual abuse.

Comments:

Submitted by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles:

REDACTED
REDACTED

209971

ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES **Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting**

This report involves:

☐ Current Minor and Church Employee/volunteer
☐ Current Minor and Priest
☒ Past Minor and Priest
☐ Past Minor and Religious Brother
☐ Past Minor and Religious Sister
☐ Adult/Adult Case
☐ Other

This Abuse was Sexual: ☒

This abuse was Physical: ☐

There was inappropriate touch: ☐

There was harassment: ☐

Confidential Report

Brief Summary: Oral & anal sex by priest with a minor.

To:

☐ Fr. REDACTED

☐ REDACTED

☒ REDACTED

☒ REDACTED (2) 1 for cmob

☐ REDACTED

☐ REDACTED

☐ REDACTED

and supervisors(s)

Human Resources

Submitted by:
 REDACTED

Assistance Ministry Office

Date 1-24-08

Response needed none

Distributed 1/24/08

Revised 8/6/07

209972

CURIA OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES IN CALIFORNIA

RE: MICHAEL E. WEMPE

Report of Alleged *Graviora Delicta*

Table of Contents

1. Case Summary Data	1
2. Report of Results of Canonical Investigation	4
3. Documentary Exhibits	
Exhibit 1: Letter of 7 March 2002 to Cardinal Mahony.....	10
Exhibit 2: Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED	13
Exhibit 3: Claimant Questionnaire of	21
Exhibit 4: Claimant Questionnaire of	51
Exhibit 5: Claimant Questionnaire of	69
Exhibit 6: Claimant Questionnaire of	79
Exhibit 7: Claimant Questionnaire of	89
Exhibit 8: Claimant Questionnaire of	95
Exhibit 9: Claimant Questionnaire of	101
Exhibit 10: Memo of 14 March 1988.....	110
Exhibit 11: REDACTED 's Letter and REDACTED s Letter of Febru- ary 1988.....	112
Exhibit 12: Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED	115
Exhibit 13: Archdiocese Child Abuse and Neglect Non-Mandatory Reporting Form of 27 June 2005.....	124
Exhibit 14: Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED	128
Exhibit 15: Memo of 22 November 1987	135
Exhibit 16: Article from Los Angeles Times, 19 November 2005	138
Exhibit 17: Letter of 13 December 1977 to Cardinal Manning and Memo of 2 February 1978 to the Cardinal.....	140
Exhibit 18: Letter of 22 May 1987 to Msgr. Curry.....	146
Exhibit 19: Letter of Msgr. Curry of 17 June 1987.....	149
Exhibit 20: Letter of 23 December 1987 to Cardinal Mahony.....	153
Exhibit 21: Letter of 6 January 1989 to Father Wempe	156
Exhibit 22: Letter of 17 February 1989 to Father Wempe	158
Exhibit 23: Selected Press Reports.....	160
Exhibit 24: Further Media Coverage.....	187
4. Authentication of Report.....	221

DIOCESE	Los Angeles in California
NAME OF ORDINARY	Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
CDF PROT. NO.	659/2004 – 21302
NAME OF CLERIC	Reverend Michael E. Wempe

PERSONAL DATA	Date of Birth	1 November 1939	Age	66
	Ordination	30 April 1966	Years of ministry	36
DIOCESE OF ORDINATION AND INCARDINATION			Los Angeles in California	
CONTACT ADDRESS OF THE CLERIC			Twin Towers Correctional Facility 450 Baucher Street Los Angeles, CA 90012	
PROCURATOR: None				
ASSIGNMENTS				
Year	Parish	Location	Appointment	
1966	St. John Chrysostom	Inglewood, California	Parochial Vicar	
1969	St. Andrew	Pasadena, California	Parochial Vicar	
1969	St. Rose of Lima	Simi Valley, California	Parochial Vicar	
1973	St. Jude	Westlake Village, California	Parochial Vicar	
1977	Sacred Heart	Ventura (Saticoy), California	Parochial Vicar	
1978	Paraclete High School	Palmdale, California	Faculty	
1978	St. Mary	Palmdale, California	Residence	
1984	St. Sebastian	Santa Paula, California	Parochial Vicar	
1986	Sabbatical			
1987	St. Sebastian	Santa Paula, California	Administrator	
1987	Sick Leave			
1988-2002	Cedars-Sinai Hospital	Los Angeles, California	Chaplain	
1988	St. Ambrose	West Hollywood, California	Residence	
2001	Cathedral Chapel	Los Angeles, California	Residence	
2002	Private residence	Seal Beach, California	Early retirement without faculties.	

409323

ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE CLERIC				
Year	Victim	Age	Imputable Acts	Denunciation
1991-1995	REDACTED	11-15	Placing boy on his lap and fondling genitals both over and under clothing; oral copulation; five occasions over a four year period	2003
1977-1983		7-14	Massaging the boy's crotch during motorcycle rides; put hand inside shorts and manipulating the genitals; grabbing of buttocks; kissing; exposing himself to the boy; touching the boy with his penis. On one occasion, while helping the boy learn to drive, the priest put his hands inside the boy's pants and caused an accident, on passenger nearly died and the priest suffered severe internal injuries. Hundreds of incidents of abuse	2003
1975-1978		12-15	Fondling of genitals while motorcycle riding; patting of buttocks; fondling genitals underneath the boy's clothing; exposing himself to the boy	2003
1974		15-16	Exposing himself to the complainant; fondling the boy's genitals; one occasion	2003
1984-1987			Unspecified claim of molestation	2002
1984-1987			Unspecified claim of molestation	2002
1977-1981		11-15	Skin to skin fondling, approximately 150 occasions of abuse	2003
1979		12-15	Sleeping with boy, putting his hands under the pajamas and fondling the boy's genitals; aggressive pursuit of fondling; one incident of oral sex. Approximately 40-50 incidents of abusive activities over a two and a half year period	2003
1979-1982		10-13	On camping and a skiing trip and on the motorcycle, unspecified abusive actions	2003
1969-1977		?	Unspecified molestation	February 1988
1974-1977		13-15	During sleep-overs placing hand under pajamas; fondling penis and masturbating the boy	February 1988
1980-1983		14-16	Fondling during motorcycle rides; fondling legs and buttocks; oral sex; mutual masturbation; one incident of anal rape. Over 50 incidents of various types of abuse	2003
1976-1978		14-16	Fondling of genitals; grabbing penis while wrestling; oral copulation; masturbation; other sexual acts	March 2002
CIVIL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CLERIC				
Year	Type/Case	Results		
2003	Arrested and charged with 42 counts of sexually molesting five boys in the 1970s and 1980s	Case dismissed when U.S. Supreme Court struck down California State law retroactively extending criminal statute of limitations		
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (02CC05471), REDACTED	Pending		
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (SC036536), REDACTED	Pending		
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC308555), REDACTED	Pending		

409324

CIVIL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CLERIC (continued)		
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC308665), REDACTED	Pending
2006	Criminal trial on four counts of lewd conduct with a minor in 1990s and one count sexual molestation of a minor (oral copulation) in 1990s	Found guilty of the count of sexual molestation of a minor; jury unable to reach a verdict on the other four charges; sentenced to three years in prison
MEASURES ADOPTED BY THE DIOCESE		
Year	Action taken	
1987	Intervention, treatment at Servants of the Paraclete, Jemez Springs, New Mexico	
1988	Restoration to limited ministry	
2002	Retirement without faculties	
SUSTENANCE PROVIDED BY THE DIOCESE TO THE CLERIC		
When placed on leave of absence in 2002, Father Wempe was provided with monthly salary and transportation. On 1 November 2004, when he turned 65, he began to collect from the Priests' Pension Fund of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. In accord with Archdiocesan policy, loans were extended to him during the period of the initial criminal investigation.		
RESPONSE/RECOURSE MADE BY THE CLERIC		
Year	Type of Response/Recourse	
2005	In course of State criminal trial, makes admission through civil attorney that he sexually abused 13 minor boys in the 1970s and 1980s, but denies charges for which he is currently on trial (alleged sexual abuse of a minor boy between 1991-1995)	
BISHOP'S VOTUM		
Based on the results of the canonical investigation, and on Father Wempe's refusal to seek laicization voluntarily, the <i>votum</i> expressed in the matter is that Wempe be dismissed <i>ex officio</i> from the clerical state by His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI. Although the measures already taken with regard to Wempe — viz., his withdrawal from active ministry and the revocation of his priestly faculties — seem sufficient for his personal correction in the matter, the need to repair the scandal given and the obligation to restore justice cannot be sufficiently met without further action on the part of the Church. Given the egregious nature of the offenses committed, their great number, the ample publicity surrounding them and the immense harm done to both the Christian faithful and the community at large, it is believed that anything short of an <i>ex officio</i> dismissal will not adequately resolve the issue nor bring it to a proper closure		

REPORT

Results of the Canonical Investigation into the *Graviora Delicta* Allegedly Committed by the Reverend Michael Edwin Wempe

SPECIES FACTI

The Reverend Michael Edwin Wempe was born on 1 November 1939 and was ordained a priest for service in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles on 30 April 1966. From the date of his ordination until his early retirement in 2002, Wempe was assigned as Parochial Vicar to seven different parishes (1966-1978, 1984-1986), as a faculty member of a Catholic high school (1978-1984), as parish administrator (1987) and as a hospital chaplain (1988-2002). During this same time, he was also granted sabbatical leave in 1986 and sick leave in 1987.

Difficulties with superiors and staff members, excessive emotional outbursts and a series of improper and imprudent relationships with minor boys gave rise to a long history of conflict in Wempe's first parish assignments, culminating in Wempe's being sent in 1987 to a facility specializing in psychological evaluation and diagnosis, after which he took part in a six-month inpatient therapy program. At the end of this treatment program, continuing individual therapy was strongly recommended as well as participation in a priest support group. It was also recommended that in any future ministry Wempe avoid all contact with minors and be helped to stay away from situations in which he might form manipulative relationships with relatively vulnerable individuals.

In 1988, two brothers, in their twenties, claimed that Wempe had sexually abused them some fourteen years earlier; one of these young men reported that the abuse occurred over a two-year period for a total of about ten incidents. In 2002, a 40-year-old man reported that Wempe had sexually abused him 26 years earlier, with multiple acts of abuse being perpetrated against him over a two-year period. In that same year, 2002, the Archdiocese granted Wempe early retirement for medical reasons; priestly faculties were also withdrawn at this time. In 2002 and 2003, several other men came forward, accusing Wempe of sexually abusing them when they were pre-teenagers and teenagers. Wempe was arrested in 2003 and was charged with sexually molesting five boys in the 1970s and 1980s; however, these charges were later dismissed when the United States Supreme Court struck down a California State law that had sought to retroactively extend the criminal statute of limitations for such crimes.

Later that same year, 2003, new accusations were made, advanced by a younger brother of two of the alleged victims for whom Wempe could no longer be tried because of the expiration of the statute of limitations. The new accusations claimed five episodes of abuse by Wempe that took place between 1991 and 1995; as the statute of limitations had not expired for these new allegations, Wempe was arrested and tried on four counts of lewd conduct with a minor and one count of sexual molestation of a minor. Wempe was found guilty of sexual molestation, but the jury was unable to reach a verdict on the other four counts. Wempe was subsequently sentenced to three years in prison, which he is now serving.

IN FACTO

Everything presented here is drawn from documents on file in the archives of the Curia of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, copies of which are attached hereto as numbered Exhibits.

Alleged Victim No. 1: REDACTED, born REDACTED, 14-15 years old at time alleged abuse began

In response to 2002 media coverage of priests removed from ministry due to sexual misconduct with minors, REDACTED wrote a letter to Cardinal Roger Mahony reporting that from 1976 to 1978, when REDACTED was 14-16 years old, he had been sexually abused repeatedly by Father Michael Wempe (see Exhibit 1, Letter of 7 March 2002 to Cardinal Mahony).

In a later more complete statement, REDACTED reported that these episodes of abuse started with monthly rides with Wempe on Wempe's motorcycle. During these rides, Wempe would fondle REDACTED putting his, Wempe's, hands between REDACTED's legs and rubbing; Wempe would explain that he "was trying to keep his hands warm". The abuse continued and escalated. In 1978, on a trip to Tijuana, Mexico, Wempe would wrestle with REDACTED and grab his penis; REDACTED also reported that Wempe taught him to masturbate during this trip. That same year, 1978, on a 7-10 day trip to visit REDACTED's grandparents, Wempe would have REDACTED sleep in the same bed with him and would masturbate himself and REDACTED and would engage in oral sex with REDACTED. Abuse also took place at a cabin, some 6-9 times: Wempe would again have REDACTED sleep with him in the same bed and would masturbate REDACTED. He would instruct REDACTED to masturbate him, Wempe, and would attempt to engage in anal sex with him. He also performed oral sex on REDACTED (see Exhibit 2, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 2: REDACTED, born REDACTED, 7-16 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED reported that the abuse began in 1977, when he was 7 years old, on motorcycle rides with Wempe, during which Wempe would fondle REDACTED's genitals. Other activities included sleeping in the same bed, Wempe attempting to masturbate REDACTED hugging and kissing him and grabbing his buttocks, exposing himself to REDACTED touching REDACTED with his, Wempe's, penis. In January 1986, after REDACTED had obtained his learner's permit for driving, Wempe was giving him a driving lesson in Wempe's car with REDACTED driving, also in the car was REDACTED's younger brother REDACTED (Alleged Victim No. 4 below). In the course of this driving "lesson", Wempe sat very close to REDACTED with his, Wempe's, left hand inside REDACTED's pants. On this occasion, REDACTED became distracted and drifted out of his lane into on-coming traffic on a two-lane highway. Wempe yanked the steering wheel, attempting to bring the car safely across the lane of on-coming traffic, but the car was broad-sided by a large commercial truck, severely injuring REDACTED's younger brother REDACTED who nearly died as a result of the accident. That was the last time that Wempe abused REDACTED (see Exhibit 3, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 3: REDACTED, born REDACTED, 12-15 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED is the older brother of Alleged Victim No. 2 above. He reported that the abuse began while he was on day-trips and camping trips with Wempe, and that there were a minimum of 50 episodes of abuse. The abuse would also be perpetrated while he was with Wempe on Wempe's motorcycle, while he was alone with Wempe in his, REDACTED's, home and at the rectory of St. Jude's Church. Wempe would fondle REDACTED's genitals and expose himself to REDACTED (see Exhibit 4, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 4: REDACTED, born REDACTED, 11-15 years old at time of alleged abuse.

REDACTED is the younger brother of Alleged Victims Nos. 2 and 3 above. He reported that the abuse occurred on five occasions when he was alone with Wempe for half-day periods. Al-

leged activities include Wempe fondling REDACTED's genitals, attempting to masturbate REDACTED and performing oral sex on him (see Exhibit 5, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

This is also the only allegation of abuse that would have taken place after Wempe had completed his therapy and treatment program, and it is the only allegation that does not appear credible. The accusation was made after the Courts determined that the statute of limitations blocked Wempe's prosecution on previous allegations, including those of the two REDACTED brothers appearing above (Alleged Victims Nos. 2 and 3). The accusations of this alleged victim were the basis of the criminal trial against Wempe, the trial at which Wempe was found guilty of one count of sexual molestation of a minor and for which Wempe is now serving a three-year prison term.

Alleged Victim No. 5: REDACTED born REDACTED 12-15 years old at time of alleged abuse
 REDACTED reported a history of abuse by Wempe over a period of 2-2½ years, while Wempe was in residence at St. Mary's Church in Palmdale, for a total of 4-50 episodes. Abusive acts included fondling of genitals while riding with Wempe on Wempe's motorcycle, while in Wempe's car and at the rectory. Wempe and REDACTED would also sleep together in the same bed and there was one episode of Wempe performing oral sex on REDACTED (see Exhibit 6, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 6: REDACTED born REDACTED 11-15 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED is the older brother of Alleged Victim No. 5 above. He reported that he was abused by Wempe approximately 150 times while Wempe was in residence at St. Mary's Church in Palmdale. Abusive acts included skin-to-skin fondling on camping trips, in the car, when spent the night with Wempe at the church rectory and at Wempe's mother's house in Seal Beach (see Exhibit 7, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 7: REDACTED born REDACTED 10-13 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED is the younger brother of Alleged Victims Nos. 5 and 6 above. Without specifying what was involved in the abusive acts, he reported that he was abused by Wempe "countless times over a [period of] three to four years". He added that "my brothers REDACTED stayed with Father Mike during the same times I did" (see Exhibit 8, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 8: REDACTED born REDACTED 13-14 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED reported that from 1974 to 1975 he was sexually abused a total of about ten times by Wempe. These episodes of abuse took place on Wempe's motorcycle, in Wempe's camper and at the rectory of St. Jude's Church; they included Wempe fondling REDACTED genitals and masturbating REDACTED while restraining him. REDACTED also claimed that his brother REDACTED was sexually abused by Wempe as well (see Exhibit 9, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 9: REDACTED date of birth unknown, a young teenager at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED is the brother of Alleged Victim No. 8 above and has provided no explicit statement concerning his being sexually abused by Wempe. However, his brother REDACTED claims that REDACTED was abused by Wempe, and both brothers met with REDACTED

REDACTED

ED of the Archdiocese, to speak with REDACTED about their experiences of abuse (see Exhibit 10, Memo of 14 March 1988). Of this meeting, REDACTED wrote that "REDACTED also spoke of his experiences, similar to REDACTED, and REDACTED himself, in a letter to REDACTED, stated that "numerous, diverse thoughts have gone through my head ... most profound, painful, and obvious of them is the thought/feeling that came to me as REDACTED began to explain the whole situation ... That is, that this silence over years and years, due to selfishness and the will to survive, served only to protect this man in the ugly things he was doing. I only wish now that I'd've passed this info along to you (or whomever) long ago, so that more could have been done sooner. Somehow I felt, I guess, that my information would affect [sic] no change, that I was powerless" (see Exhibit 11, REDACTED's Letter and REDACTED's Letter of February 1988).

Alleged Victim No. 10: REDACTED born REDACTED, 14-16 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED reported that he was abused more than 50 times by Wempe while Wempe was teaching at Paraclete High School in Palmdale and in residence at St. Mary's. The abuse included fondling and caressing, the viewing of pornographic material, REDACTED's being masturbated twice by Wempe, being asked twice to masturbate Wempe, being asked twice to perform oral sex on Wempe, having oral sex performed once on him by Wempe and being raped once by Wempe (see Exhibit 12, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 11: REDACTED, born REDACTED, 6, 7 or 8 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED reported that in 1985, 1986 or 1987, while Wempe was at St. Sebastian Church in Santa Paula, Wempe touched REDACTED's naked body, fondled his genitals and performed oral sex on him. REDACTED further alleged that Wempe had done similar things to REDACTED's older brother REDACTED (see Exhibit 13, Archdiocese Child Abuse and Neglect Non-Mandatory Reporting Form of 27 June 2005).

Alleged Victim No. 12: REDACTED, date of birth unknown, age at time of alleged abuse unknown

REDACTED is the older brother of Alleged Victim No. 11 above and has not come forward himself to make any claims of sexual abuse against Wempe. However, his brother alleged that REDACTED also was a victim of Wempe's abuse (see Exhibit 13, Archdiocese Child Abuse and Neglect Non-Mandatory Reporting Form of 27 June 2005).

Alleged Victim No. 13: REDACTED born REDACTED 15-16 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED claimed that he was abused by Wempe while Wempe was at St. Jude's in Westlake Village; Wempe was a priest, family friend and advisor. The abuse took place at the sauna and swimming pool areas of the Oakview Apartments in Westlake Village, and included Wempe exposing himself to REDACTED suggesting that REDACTED do the same, and fondling REDACTED's genitals (see Exhibit 14, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Statements of Wempe regarding accusations

Because of pending criminal and civil litigation, Wempe made no direct statements to canonical auditors regarding his guilt or innocence of the allegations advanced against him. However, in the course of his criminal trial, he did admit through his legal counsel that he was

guilty of sexually molesting thirteen minor boys in the 1970s and the 1980s. Despite this acknowledgment of guilt, he staunchly maintained his innocence of the molestation alleged by REDACTED (see Exhibit 16, Article from *Los Angeles Times*, 19 November 2005; and Exhibit 24, Further Media Coverage), for which he was currently on trial.

Moreover, issues of confidentiality preclude disclosing any statements made by Wempe in the course of his initial psychological testing and evaluation, and during his subsequent program of therapy and treatment. However, while Wempe was in said Treatment Program, he was visited by the Vicar for Clergy, who reported afterwards to Cardinal Mahony that he and Wempe had spent "a considerable amount of time discussing the confidentiality of reports". Wempe was "afraid the records will be sought by the courts at some time and that they could convict him". The Vicar also reported that "we discussed the possibility of legal problems in the future. [Fr. Wempe] is very aware that what he did comes within the scope of the criminal law in California. Although I do not know the exact details, he told me that there was some sexual touching, although most of his activity would better be described as 'cuddling'. He also mentioned that with the exception of one boy, all the others involved are now over twenty-one" (see Exhibit 15, Memo of 22 November 1987).

Finally, after his conviction and sentencing, Wempe was visited by an archdiocesan representative who asked Wempe to consider the possibility of voluntarily petitioning the Holy Father for laicization. While recognizing the inevitability of his being dismissed from the clerical state because of his admitted failings, Wempe stated that "priesthood is too precious to me to sign it away myself".

Adminicula

From the time of his first assignments in the Archdiocese, Wempe has had a series of difficulties and problems, particularly with superiors, such that recommendations were made that he receive professional help (see Exhibit 17, Letter of 13 December 1977 to Cardinal Manning and Memo of 2 February 1978 to the Cardinal). In 1987, the newly assigned REDACTED at St. Sebastian Church in Santa Paula wrote to the Vicar for Clergy with serious concerns about Wempe's relationships with young boys at the parish (see Exhibit 18, Letter of 22 May 1987 to Msgr. Curry). In light of these problems with authority and of possible sexual misconduct with minors, Wempe was sent to a diagnostic facility in New Mexico for complete psychological evaluation and treatment (see Exhibit 19, Letter of Msgr. Curry of 17 June 1987).

This evaluation and testing drew specific conclusions regarding Wempe's behavior, and Wempe remained in the New Mexico facility for a six-month program of in-house therapy and treatment. Throughout this time, periodic reports were sent to Cardinal Mahony regarding Fr. Wempe's progress, with a final report being made at the conclusion of this treatment. The confidentiality of all the information contained in those various reports, however, is protected by Federal Law, and since Fr. Wempe has not given specific written consent for the further disclosure of that information, none of it may be presented here.

This notwithstanding, at the conclusion of Wempe's treatment program, the Director of the facility sent a letter to Cardinal Mahony to apprise the Cardinal of the final recommendations relative to Wempe. In this letter, the contents of which are not covered by the above-mentioned confidentiality clauses, the Director noted that "individual therapy is clearly called for" and the recommendation was made that that in considerations of future ministry, Wempe "needs to be in a situation which will allow him to avoid all contact with minors and also help him stay away from the opportunity for forming manipulative relationships with people who are relatively vulnerable" (see Exhibit 20, Letter of 23 December 1987 to Cardinal Mahony).

Moreover, in 1988, one of Wempe's alleged victims was informed that the Archdiocese would pay for counseling if the victim so desired (see Exhibit 10, Memo of 14 March 1988). The victim took advantage of this offer, and the Vicar for Clergy asked Wempe to reimburse the

Archdiocese in the amount it paid out for therapy for this individual, as archdiocesan policy holds that it is the responsibility of the priest involved to assist the injured party (see Exhibit 21, Letter of 6 January 1989 to Father Wempe). Wempe responded by sending a check for \$490 to cover the costs involved (see Exhibit 22, Letter of 17 February 1989 to Father Wempe).

The case of Michael Wempe has been amply publicized in the media (see Exhibit 23, Selected Press Reports), including his admission through legal counsel of his crimes (see Exhibit 24, Further Media Coverage)

CONCLUSION

From the evidence brought forth in this investigation, including the admissions made by the cleric involved, it is certain that delicts, as described in canon 2359 §2 of the 1917 *CIC* and maintained in canon 1395 §2 of the 1983 *CIC*, have been committed.

Exhibit 1

Letter of 7 March 2002 to
Cardinal Mahony

409332

REDACTED

11

March 7, 2002

Cardinal Roger Michael Mahony
Archdiocese Of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Ref: Rev. Michael Wimpe

Dear Cardinal Mahony,

I read with interest the Los Angeles Times article about the priests recently removed due to sexual misconduct with minors. I wanted to make sure the church was aware that that Rev. Michael Wimpe sexually abused me, and most likely other young/teenage boys during his time spent at St. Jude Church in Westlake Village, and other parishes. Rev Wimpe molested me multiple times while he was located at St. Jude, another parish in Venture and while at the Catholic high school located in the Palmdale/Lancaster area.

My abuse happened while I was 14 to 16 years old (roughly 1976 to 1978). It would happen during weekend trips to the mountains where he had arranged to use for a weekend, a cabin, and in a vacation trailer. The abuse consisted of: fondling of genitals, oral sex, masturbation, and other sexual acts.

I have been in therapy for almost 10 years now, to deal with this and the problems resulting from his abuse and the environment at home, which enable him to be so successful. I should have written this letter many years ago to alert the church, and perhaps make more of a difference. The Sheriff's office of Los Angeles County has a report of this incident, since a therapist was required to report the crime.

I would like to see the church work actively to address these types of complaints. I believe that priests who commit crimes should be held fully accountable including going to jail. In addition, it is vitally important that work needs to be done by the church to address "sexuality issues" of priests and nuns (and lay-people in the church), prior to these people being allowed to work with kids.

You of course can throw this letter out and act as if nothing has happened. However, I would suspect I am not the first to come forward regarding this individual, since the last I had heard, he was placed at Cedar Sinai Medical Center. Clearly, placing a priest at a Jewish hospital, when you are short of them, is an admission of a problem being kept under-wraps.

409333

CCI 005927

REDACTED

12

I am continuing my therapy to re-claim what was damaged by my relationship with Rev. Wimpe. As a survivor, I will not allow the past to ruin my future; I work daily to make my marriage of almost 9 years better, and to be the loving and caring father to my two daughters and stepson that they deserve. I have not been to a church in many years, only for funerals and weddings. I continue to struggle with the concept of teaching religious values to my children. I am a person with strong moral values and good ethics, which I try and demonstrate in my life, whether at home or at work. I currently believe that my children will best be served by not having a formal religious education until they are old enough to determine who they are as a person, and what religion brings to their life.

This issue has caused a great deal of anxiety in my life, which is treated with medication, and continues to today. I am saddened when I read about the church's slow response in Boston. I hope that the statistics listed in the article are not representative of the general population of priest in the United States (10% of the area priests have been accused of sexual or child abuse). However, I fear this is an under-reported statistic due to the stigma often associated with sexual abuse. Only people in your position have the power to make changes, to stop the denial and make healthy changes for the people you serve.

I would like to ask of the church, what it intends to do to specifically address my abuse by Rev. Michael Wimpe. And what it intends to do to keep this from continuing in the future with other kids.

Sincerely,
REDACTED

REDACTED

409334

CCI 005928

Exhibit 2

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED REDACTED

409335

REDACTED
REDACTED

Exhibit 3

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED

409343

WMPK

REDACTED

Claimant Questionnaire

Exhibit 4

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED

409373

CONFIDENTIAL
Claimant Questionnaire

REDACTED

Exhibit 5

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED

409391

Wfmlc

Claimant Questionnaire

REDACTED

Exhibit 6

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED

409401

WAMR

REDACTED

Claimant Questionnaire

Exhibit 7:

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED

409411

JUN-20-2004 10:20

Claimant Questionnaire

REDACTED

Exhibit 8

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED

409417

Claimant Questionnaire

REDACTED

(

Exhibit 9

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED

409423

WFMPE

Claimant Questionnaire

REDACTED

Exhibit 10

Memo of 14 March 1988

409432

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 14, 1988
FROM: Monsignor Curry
TO: File
RE: Michael Wempe

REDACTED - REDACTED

Had spoken to REDACTED He was in the Junior Seminary about thirteen years ago and was abused by Mike Wempe, who was a family friend. His mother was the only one who knew about it and was and has been terribly upset about it. I told him the Archdiocese would pay for counseling, and he and his mother may go.

He asked me if I would have any objection to his confronting Mike Wempe, and I said no. He did not want me to talk to him in advance.

I explained that he had been through major treatment, and that he had responded well. Also, I explained he was in a controlled situation whereby he would not be in ministry to minors.

Exhibit 11

REDACTED's Letter and
REDACTED's Letter
of February 1988

409434



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 Santa Barbara Pastoral Region
 3240 Calle Pinon
 Santa Barbara, California 93105
 805-682-0442

REDACTED

February 8, 1988

Dear Tom,

As per your request that I put in writing the revelations made to me recently about FR. MIKE WEMPE, I am jotting down these notes.

Last week, two young men, REDACTED had dinner with me at their request and revealed their facts and feelings. Both men are in their twenty's, REDACTED is married, and REDACTED is looking forward to being so. They seem to have "weathered the storm" of their experience with Mike fairly well.

They indicated that when they were in their teenage years, young teens, Mike had several times molested them in his camper while on outing with them. REDACTED finally confronted Mike with this, even kicked him out of the bed once, which Mike had persuaded him to sleep in for lack of bed space, and finally totally broke off any communication with Mike. REDACTED also spoke of his experiences, similar to REDACTED.

I know the family well. REDACTED was in the seminary at OLQA during my tenure there and we are very good friends. Their veracity is very strong in my view.

I have enclosed a letter I received yesterday from REDACTED, giving more of his feelings, since during our dinner-talk REDACTED did most of the talking.

I ask you to keep this confidential to the extent that you can. I was unaware of this matter until recently, though there were occasional "rumors" of something like this.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
 REDACTED

Most REDACTED

Feb. 5, 1988

114

Padre,

Much thanks for spending the evening with
and I yesterday

REDACTED

Numerous, diverse thoughts have gone through my head
since then; most profound, painful, and obvious of them
is the thought (feeling) that came to me as
began to explain the whole situation That is, that
this silence over years and years, due to selfishness
and the will to survive, served only to protect this
man in the ugly things he was doing. I only wish
now that I'd've passed this info along to you
(or whomever) long ago, so that more could have been
done sooner. Somehow I felt, I guess, that my
~~information~~ would affect no change, that I was powerless.

REDACTED

Nevertheless, here we are today, and I appreciate your
friendship. Let's have that dinner (and movie?) someday
soon in fine or Gordale. Pick a day in March, and
let us know. Peace to you!

REDACTED

409436

Exhibit 12

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED

409437

WAMPF

Claimant Questionnaire

REDACTED

Exhibit 13

Archdiocese Child Abuse and
Neglect Non-Mandatory Reporting
Form of 27 June 2005

409446



**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM**

Date of This Report to Public Authority: N/A

Name of Public Authority: N/A

Date of This Report to Archdiocese: 4/28/05

Reported to Archdiocese by: Mrs. REDACTED

Alleged Victim: her son

Current Address:

Telephone: REDACTED

Date of Birth

Alleged Perpetrator:

Name Fr. Michael Wempe

Names of Possible Witnesses:

Reported Date of Incident:

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s): Fr. Wempe was the pastor at their Parish

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect: Sexual

Comments: Mother reports that her son, now 25 years old has always been a very angry person and has been in trouble on occasion. He has had some counseling and the therapists have always asked if had ever been sexually molested, something he did not admit at the time. Now her son says he is remembering several incidents. Mrs. REDACTED related some of her personal circumstances and has now decided that the best thing to do is to let her son call us directly. She will ask him to do that. I asked Mrs. REDACTED to please follow up with us to make sure her son does call us. We are not to call her at home. Mrs. REDACTED has another son, now thirty, who has not denied being molested but has emphatically stated he does not want to talk about it. A complete report will be prepared when we have the information from the son. I assured Mrs. REDACTED that we would provide counseling for her son if he wishes and also asked her if she thought she might benefit from some counseling herself. At this time she said no, but the door was left open in case she changes her mind.

409447

**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM**

Date of this report to Public Authority:

Name of Public Authority:

Date of this Report to Archdiocese:

June 27, 2005

Reported to Archdiocese by:

REDACTED

Complainant Name:

Current Address:

Telephone:

Date of Birth:

Alleged Perpetrator:

Fr. Michael Wempe

Name: (Victim)

REDACTED . 6 years old

Name of Possible Witness:

Reported Date of Incident: (s)

Brother (also a victim -- more happened to him)
"1985 or 86 or 87 at St. Sebastian Church in Santa Paula"

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s):

"There was one incident of molestation. He (Wempe) was touching my naked body. There was touching of genitals & oral sex. He did things to my brother who was older. He was an altar boy. My father had died and some friends introduced us to Fr. Wempe." Sexual abuse of a minor under 14 years

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect:

Comments:

Submitted by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles:

REDACTED

ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM

Date of this report to Public Authority:
Name of Public Authority:

July 5, 2005 – victim report
Det. Barraclough - 213-485-2883 –
Parent report 4/21/02.
Victim reported June 27, 2005

Date of this Report to Archdiocese:

REDACTED

Reported to Archdiocese by:

Complainant Name:

Current Address:

Telephone:

Date of Birth:

Alleged Perpetrator:

Fr. Michael Wempe

Name: (Victim)

REDACTED (6 years old)

Name of Possible Witness:

Brother, REDACTED

Reported Date of Incident (s)

"1985 or 86 or 87" at St. Sebastian Church
in Santa Paula

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s):

REDACTED said, "There was one incident of
molestation. He (Wempe) was touching my
naked body. There was touching of genitals
& oral sex. He did things to my brother who
was older. He was an altar boy. My father
died and some friends introduced us to Fr.
Wempe."

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect

Sexual abuse.

Comments:

Mrs. REDACTED 's Mother) called
4/21/02. She said that she thought her sons
had been molested by Wempe. We asked
her to have them call us. 4/28/05 Mother
called again. Requested sons to call.
6/27/05 REDACTED called for the first time to
report his abuse. He was asked to have his
brother call us.

Submitted by the Archdiocese of Los
Angeles:

REDACTED

Exhibit 14

Claimant Questionnaire of
REDACTED

409450

Claimant Questionnaire

REDACTED

Exhibit 15

Memo of 22 November 1987

409457

MEMORANDUMNovember 22, 1987

To: Archbishop Mahony

From: Mgr. Thomas Curry

Re: Father Michael Wempe

I met with Mike, Father Liam Hoare, the new Director of Foundation House. Dr. REDACTED, Mike's therapist, and REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED Dr. REDACTED reported that, while Mike has had a great deal of difficulty with the Program, he has made very significant progress in the last three weeks. My experience of the meeting together with the attached indicate this is true.

We spend a considerable amount of time discussing the confidentiality of the reports on Mike. At the beginning I stated I felt bound to share the attached with you despite his wish to have it destroyed immediately. He did not ask if I had seen the previous reports, and I did not indicate that I had. Neither did he ask if they had been destroyed. He is afraid the records will be sought by the courts at some time and that they could convict him. I stressed that, from a personnel point of view, the records constituted a protection and that, for future consideration of his case, the absence of records showing his response to therapy would be a hindrance.

We discussed the possibility of legal problems in the future. He is very aware that what he did comes within the scope of the criminal law in California. Although I do not know the exact details, he told me that there was some sexual touching, although most of his activity would better be described as "cuddling." He also mentioned that, with the exception of one boy, all the others involved are now over twenty-one. I encouraged him to contact a criminal lawyer to get a more exact evaluation of his legal status. Indeed, it is surprising the counselor he attended in California did not report him, and we agreed it would be better if Mike did not return to him.

Both Mike and Dr. REDACTED agreed on the absolute necessity of his continuing counseling. This presents us with a problem, but Mike is so aware of the fact that he would be willing to go to a diocese in another state--something he would not have been willing to consider earlier in the Program.

We discussed the possibility of his consulting a lawyer who would refer him to therapy, thus putting the reports under the protection of privilege or of finding a lawyer who is also a psychiatrist. I will investigate both possibilities.

With regard to future placement, Mike presents a greater challenge than REDACTED Dr. REDACTED discouraged campus ministry for the reason that minors

or students over eighteen but who are emotionally unformed attend college. Mike agreed with this assessment. On hospital ministry, the staff disagreed. Dr. REDACTED felt this would be suitable in that it involves a transient population, and Mike tends to get into trouble with long-term relationships. Father Hoare disagreed in that hospital ministry can involve minors and can provide for a good deal of physical touching with people in all stages of consciousness. I tend to agree with Dr. REDACTED in this case but asked them to continue to discuss this matter. We agreed that Adult Education and Engaged Encounter would be suitable activities. In general, I will look for areas of ministry where we are not able to provide a priest because of the shortage of clergy.

In addition to the parishes listed, Mike mentioned Corpus Christi, Pacific Palisades as he gets on very well with REDACTED. He is most attached to his dog, and I warned him this might limit his options. I will be in continued contact as he prepares to return.

Exhibit 16

Article from Los Angeles Times
19 November 2005

409460

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2005 B3

Ex-Priest Admits Old Sex Charges

Lawyer reveals molestation of 13 boys beyond statute of limitations in attempt to curb testimony in current case.

By JEAN GUCCIONE
Times Staff Writer

The attorney for a former Los Angeles priest admitted Friday that his client had molested 13 boys in the 1970s and 1980s, an unusual public acknowledgment of guilt in the hundreds of sexual abuse cases against the Los Angeles Archdiocese.

Michael Edwin Wempe's lawyer made the admission during a hearing in a criminal case accusing the former priest of molesting another boy in the 1990s when he was chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center.

The lawyer did so for strategic reasons in an attempt to limit damaging testimony about old abuse cases while he continues to fight the current charges. Wempe's case is being watched closely because he is one of three priests accused of molesting children after Cardinal Roger M. Mahony, responding to abuse complaints, sent him to therapy and returned him to ministry.

The archdiocese has been sued by more than 560 people for allegedly failing to protect children from abuse, but the cases have long been mired in settlement talks and only a handful of the allegations have been tested in court.

The Wempe case has a tangled history. The former priest was originally charged with 42 counts stemming from decades-old molestations, one of which involved two brothers. But the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2003 that the California law allowing prosecution of old child abuse cases violated the statute of limitations, and the charges were dismissed.

The two boys' younger brother came forward and said Wempe had molested him in the 1990s, within the statutory time limit. The Times generally does not identify victims of alleged sexual abuse.

The defense contends that the younger brother fabricated his accusation to avenge his older brothers. On Friday, defense attorneys Leonard B. Levine and Donald H. Steier asked the court to limit testimony about Wempe's past molestation of the older brothers.

Noting that the current victim is the only one to come forward after 1987, when Wempe returned from therapy, they argued that an inundation of testimony about the priest's abuse history could unfairly bias jurors.

Jurors probably "will say to themselves, 'We don't care. We are going to find him guilty for what he did 20 years ago,'" Levine told the court.

Deputy Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks said he wanted to put on all 13 of Wempe's earlier victims to show that the priest was "a master" at child molestation by the time he met the younger brother.

Judge Curtis Rappe said he would allow the defense addi-

tional witnesses, but hadn't decided how many. Without the background, Rappe said, it "would give a false impression that it was just a little family conspiracy."

Wempe is accused of fondling and masturbating the younger brother during driving lessons and in a parked car. Defense lawyers have said there is no independent evidence of the brother's story. In court papers, they contended that Wempe, who denies the abuse, passed two polygraph tests.

Prosecutors "are trying to convict someone for something he didn't do based on something he did do 20 or 30 years ago," Levine said. "That is not the way the system works."

Lee Bashforth, one of Wempe's earlier victims, said the former priest should not get away with admitting past molestations without suffering consequences. Bashforth recalled watching video of the smiling priest leaving Los Angeles County Jail after the earlier case was dismissed, and his lawyer's statement that Wempe's only regret was he didn't get the chance to clear his name.

"They are obviously saying this now because the truth can not really harm them," he said.

Exhibit 17

Letter of 13 December 1977
to Cardinal Manning and
Memo of 2 February 1978
to the Cardinal

409462

REDACTED

141

I have spoken with
REDACTED

December 13, 1977.

His Eminence
Most Reverend REDACTED
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Your Eminence:

It is indeed painful to both of us to have to deal with this problem, but we would be remiss in our responsibilities to the parishoners of Sacred Heart Parish and to our brother priest Mike's cries for help, were we not to discuss this problem and look for the wisest available course of action in response to his needs.

On the pages which follow I have attempted to put into writing my observations and recommendations. Briefly, this is an intolerable situation: Mike needs prompt and competent help-- help which cannot be provided at Sacred Heart Parish.

This situation is intolerable in that it is causing serious damage to Mike's health, to the welfare of the parish, to peace and harmony in the rectory, and to me personally.

In presenting this matter directly to Your Eminence I wish not to circumvent Monsignor Rawden; I had intended to approach him first, but since Mike has already approached you and you have invited me to come see you, I have endeavored to express myself to you first in this manner. I am willing to consult with Monsignor Rawden, or to proceed in whatever manner you advise.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
REDACTED

Sacred Heart Church
Ventura, California 93003

409463

OBSERVATIONS REFLECTING STATUS OF FR. MICHAEL E. WEMPE:
AND RECTORY - PARISH RELATIONSHIP

I. SELF EVALUATION

I do have and enjoy a positive record of good relationships with priests, esp. former pastors I have served and associate pastors who have been assigned to me. This record known will speak for itself.

I do have and enjoy a good relationship, understanding and cooperation of all staff members and coworkers at the parish level. I do believe and do experience a loving, supporting and unifying parish community.

I can claim to be mentally sound, possess normal intelligence, of good character, loyal, balanced, compassionate, that I am gifted with great patience, and that I am very sensitive to feelings, needs and lives of others.

II. OBSERVATIONS AND EXPERIENCES WITH FATHER MICHAEL E. WEMPE:

He expressed to me that when the former associate pastor had been assigned for study in Rome, he petitioned the personnel board to be assigned to me quote: "you are a nice man, and this is a super parish".

He does have a pleasant, charming, friendly personality which is inviting, animates one, and opens the road to friendship. Anyone including myself feels comfortable in such encounters. Having heard from here and there that "Mike has problems - I am sorry for you", I tried to ignore this and went all the way out to welcome him to the rectory and parish life, as refurbishing his living quarters, office, introducing and recommending him to the community and sharing parish life.

He loves liturgy, preaching, dialogues, consulting people, he has a desire for youth ministry and knows to relate.

Slowly problems arose and we all experienced the other side of Father Mike. One of his first statements were that he will play golf every Thursday and that game and day are of utmost importance; that he will attend tournaments, that he will go on a 4 weeks vacation every August. Asking why he will be gone for four weeks, he replied: Pastors do - I have the same right. He expressed the wish to be in charge of CCD and I recommended to see, observe, and dialogue with present staff members. His reaction after doing this simply was: "I do not believe in the system. . . four letter words . . . I will take over". Expressing that I am ultimately responsible for the total parish including CCD, he went into a violent rage maintaining that he does not believe in a hierarchical structure, that he is copastor, does not tolerate supervision, criticism, interference. Staff members of the CCD approached me on several occasions inquiring: "What's wrong with this

man?", "We can't work with him.", "He is insulting", "He seems to ignore everybody and doing his own thing". I tried to mediate, appease, reason, call for patience. Relationships with the CCD staff became so intolerable that Fr. Mike is not involved in CCD work whatsoever.

Other avenues of work involvement as convert classes, bible classes, calls to hospitals, sick at home are "not his bag" - as he says. He only picks what he likes, does things the way he likes it, and what pleases him.

While he loves liturgy, preaching, children's Masses and has some unique and original ways of doing it, he seems in the total approach to do more harm than good. For instance: maintains that preaching over the liturgical functions he alone is in charge and nobody is telling him what to do. On one occasion he played the guitar and sang a song in lieu of a sermon. On another occasion before consecration he shares feelings with people. "The greatest sacrifice for me is not to have a physical son . . . when I say the words of consecration I receive and conceive a son - I place my son into your hands. . ."

He does not wear clerical garbs around parish, including Sunday morning to the dismay of many people. His reaction to questions: "I do not feel comfortable in it." He does not wear a watch, "Reminds me of rules, commitments, makes me nervous."

He has no tolerance and becomes extremely hostile if someone, when he cannot be reached, makes or changes appointments for him. On one occasion while asking him to take a funeral he screamed, yelled, became abusive in his language telling me that he will not do what he has not arranged himself. At another occasion - just recently - while Fr. Mike was gone for a week I had to change Fr. Mike from the 7:30 a.m. Mass on Christmas to a later Mass as the supply priest had to take this Mass because of travel. When he saw this in the appointment book Fr. Mike stormed into my room, confronted me with violent threats, very abusive language, frightful behavior, screaming - "I don't give a shit about you, you are not telling me what to do, I am appointed as pastor too, equal rights, equal in everything, I don't give a damn what you think. . . " My sister who is housekeeper, and the deacon assigned to this parish, witnessed this horrible scene.

There is in Fr. Mike an unusual high degree of jealousy and hunger for popularity. He gets very angry when he is not called, consulted, singled out. On one occasion he came into my room almost in tears expressing that he is not loved. I had a drink with him, tried to reach out and share that any change in assignment is a forceful separation and a new beginning, that patiently he should give people a chance to get to know him and love him, that in no time this can happen if he gets involved in parish functions.

He does not seem to be able to make prudent judgments. He does converse with people, puzzles, confuses and disturbs them. On one occasion a reaction to one of his sermons came to me from one of the parishioners in a letter addressed to him and me in which the writer objected to the insulting remarks he used. He called several people on the issue and even expressed that he intends public clarification. I pleaded with several

people to apologize, let go, keep quiet, as peace in the community was at stake.

III. EXISTING PROBLEMS OF CONCERN TO ME:

As difficulties and problems arose, from the very beginning, I looked into myself, prayed over, consulted confidentially a few priests who are knowledgeable, experienced and in responsible positions, receiving guidance and advice. I tried practically everything to listen to Mike's cry for help, to reach out to him, to be sensitive, expressed a great deal of patience, spoiled him, tried to be firm. I tried to help, mediate, talk to him at table, cocktail hours, staff-meeting, had sharings as he wished it. Little by little I began to realize that the more I compromised, the more he demands, that the firmer I became, the more violent he reacts. I feel responsible to be sensitive to Fr. Mike, to be aware of his feelings, to make his life at Sacred Heart a happy and growing experience, to help him to be aware of his problems, to apologize for my failings, to be sensitive to his humanness, to be a helping hand to preserve and foster his priesthood.

IV. THE PROBLEM AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS:

The existing problems somewhat illustrated above affect and impare me personally in my mental and physical well-being in the parish work I am responsible for, and in my sharing and commitment to others, as one parishioner remarked: "You don't have the enthusiasm and sparkle lately, as you used to have. Got problems?"

The rectory life suffered with these unhappy experiences, and it seems there is no relief to it. Staff members are puzzled, confused, handicapped in their work, at times have been scandalized by his behavior.

Serious and alarming effects are showing up in the parish community. Once a happy family, there appear polarization of parishioners, dismanteling of parishioners from leadership and from activities not carried or innovated by Fr. Mike. Loyalty is confused, questioned and dissensions, wandering away of people are being experienced.

All these experiences are not occasional happenings or impulsive intrusions, situations, they are on the contrary continuous re-occurrences of unhappy confrontations. This is a very serious problem, the parish unity is at stake, I feel like having a skyjacker on board endangering, harassing the flight.

I do believe that Fr. Mike suffers from psychic disorders of paranoid reactions, has schizophrenic behavior, and that "chip-on-the-shoulder" attitude. He cannot be helped by me, he is in need of profession help. In all sincerety I cannot see that a continuation of Fr. Mike's assignment to me will ever improve at this point, it only will get worse, might even be fatal. His past assignments point to this difficulty. Having received professional attention and care I can see Fr. Mike more fulfilled in a special ministry where he has freedom to expand, to experient, be on his own, as he has expressed himself: "I hate to be forced to live in a rectory, I desire to live in my own house."

February 2, 1978

Your Eminence:

This date I interviewed Father Michael Wempe.

- 1) I indicated the difficulties I have had in trying to place him in the Ventura County area;
- 2) I told him that three separate priests had recommended that I suggest that he have professional help, primarily due to difficulties we have heard existed in rectories to which he has been assigned.

Monsignor Rawden

REDACTED

Exhibit 18

Letter of 22 May 1987
to Msgr. Curry

409468

St. Sebastian's Church

235 NORTH NINTH STREET
 SANTA PAULA, CALIFORNIA 93060
 TELEPHONE (805) 525-2148

May 22, 1987

Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. Curry
 1531 West Ninth Street
 Los Angeles, CA 90015

Dear Tom,

This is not going to be an easy letter to write. Before I get into the matter, I would like to assure you that the young man who just got out of jail has found a place to stay and has already lined up a full time job in a meat market plus a part time job helping a man remodel his home.

The reason for my writing at this time, however, is something which I discussed at great length with Fr. REDACTED who suggested that I write to you and also notify REDACTED of the problem. Since Mike and I have had a great deal of friction I had hesitated in bringing this up, wondering if it would just be mud slinging on my part. But since REDACTED has made me aware of how sensitive the board is to matters of scandal involving priests in sex related issues, I feel that my silence can no longer be justified.

Before I begin, I want to affirm that no one, to my knowledge, has made any accusations. But the potential for danger appears to me to be very great.

When I came here, there was a king size bed in my bedroom. I used only half of it. Meanwhile, Mike was sleeping diagonally on a double size bed. I suggested that we switch beds, since I didn't need such a big bed and he could easily use one. So we switched beds on the Saturday after Easter. After we had moved his bed into my room, the housekeeper came in and told me that I should throw out that double size mattress and buy a new one. I asked her why, since it appeared all right to me. She then told me that two years ago Mike had a ten year old boy sleeping with him and the kid wet the bed and soaked the mattress. I saw no stain on it, so I have kept the mattress.

Just about a week ago, she again repeated her urging. I told her that I didn't see any reason to throw it out because it was only wet on once. She then said: "No, Father, it happened at least three times that I know of." She told me the boy had brought a sleeping bag with him, but it was never used and she would find the bed soaking wet.

409469

I am pretty certain that this is the same boy that Mike took with him, just the two of them, in his house-trailer from April 20th to the 22nd, this year. He played golf here on the 22nd and then left again the next morning in his trailer with two other boys, who are brothers, ages 7 and 12. They too were gone for two days. Though I have no evidence that anything improper occurred, the whole situation seems extremely imprudent.

There is another aspect of his relationship with these boys that disturbs me, and that is the issue of firearms. About two weeks ago, the public school teacher of this seven year old child called on the phone, seeking advice. She was disturbed by the anger and hatred that this boy has exhibited in class, both in his conduct and in his written work. The child's father, REDACTED

REDACTED The child has never accepted it. What disturbed the teacher, among other things, was a story that the child wrote about shooting and killing a rattlesnake with a gun. He said that it made him feel good when he did that. The teacher was wondering if she should bring this matter up with the child's mother, since she knew there was already a lot of stress in the home. But the teacher also expressed astonishment that any adult would let a seven year old child, especially one that is so angry, shoot a gun.

It came as a shocker to me when I realized that Mike was the one she was talking about, even though she was unaware of it. Mike told me that they had killed a rattlesnake when they were away during Easter week, and he even showed me the snake's skin. I have trouble with the idea of priests teaching children to shoot guns, apart from the question of this particular child's emotional problems.

How much and how many people know about the matters I have related here I would have no way of knowing. Mike is still very much involved with the three boys mentioned above. I would judge that his association with them is rather widely known, since he usually schedules them to serve only at his Masses and he is very close friends with their families.

I have discussed this situation with REDACTED He asked that I relay in this letter that he would like you to contact him about this matter as soon as possible. There are other details which he can relate to you, including names which I do not wish to put in writing.

Sincerely yours,
REDACTED

cc REDACTED

Exhibit 19

Letter of Msgr. Curry
of 17 June 1987

409471

CONFIDENTIAL

150



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
 1531 WEST NINTH STREET
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
 (213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
 (213) 251-3284

June 17, 1987

REDACTED

Servants of the Paraclete
 Jemez Springs
 New Mexico 87025

Dear REDACTED

Since Father Michael Wempe is going to Jemez Springs on Monday, June 22 for the diagnostic program there, I am sending you some background information. We hope that as a result of the diagnostic tests, the program there will be able to accept and assist him.

Earlier this year, Father Wempe applied for the pastorate of St. Sebastian parish in Santa Paula. He was not appointed, but the whole process of the appointment of a pastor to the parish and subsequent events there have brought his life increasingly under review by several people.

At a public hearing in the parish before the selection of a new pastor, attended by about 120 persons), it emerged that some people were very much in favor of Father Wempe's being appointed pastor. They cited his excellent qualities: his ability to work with youth, his liveliness, preaching, liturgy, etc. It also emerged that others were very much opposed to such an appointment. They saw him as being a part of the problems in the parish and said that what the parish needed was a whole new start. It would be difficult to estimate the numbers in either of these groups, but they were definitely distinct entities.

When Father Wempe came to the Personnel Board for his interview, the members were surprised--I might even say distressed--as a result of the meeting. They found him "hyper," extraordinarily emotionally attached to the parish. He seemed to emphasize that he was totally loved by the people, and yet when they asked him about how to reconcile with those who disagreed with him or did not want him as pastor, he seemed to have a completely unrealistic assessment of his ability to do so.

The Board was so unfavorably impressed that none of its members would even consider recommending him for the pastorate.

409472

CCI 006066

REDACTED

151

I make no judgment about subsequent events. However, I would point out that Father Wempe's behavior since the appointment of a new pastor has not been conducive to the latter's really taking over and getting a hold on the assignment. For instance, Father Mike wept in introducing him at all the Masses and let the people know how disappointed he had been in his failure to get the appointment.

There have also been many and fairly severe conflicts with the new pastor, though I repeat that I am making no judgment as to blame in this instance. The Board members, however, have felt strongly for some time that it is essential that Father Mike be away from St. Sebastian.

His history of conflict in parishes goes back a long way. There are several letters in the files, some indicating extreme approbation for him but others very critical of him. There is one note saying that Monsignor Rawden, the former Chancellor, interviewed him in February 1978 and told him then that three separate priests had recommended he receive professional help, primarily because of difficulties existing in rectories.

A number of priests have expressed admiration for Father Mike's love of the Liturgy, for his preaching, and his ability to relate to young people. However, the other side they see is an inability to deal with authority--especially pastors' authority--and his going into almost uncontrollable rage when challenged on this. They have pointed out an absolute determination on his part to take over, to use very strong language about pastors, about hierarchical authority, about any kind of authority that seems to challenge his own.

He has had difficulty working with staff members in parishes. They have claimed he was irrational, insulting, and impossible to work with. Some of these complaints are that things he does not like to do, e.g., visiting hospital, he simply dismisses and says "that's not my thing" and utterly refuses to do them.

While he cares about the Liturgy and is talented in that area, again, some of the complaints have been that it absolutely had to be handled his way, that no one could discuss planning or anything else with him.

There are also complaints about violent verbal attacks on pastors, abusive language, screaming, and rage. He seems to have an extraordinary hunger for popularity and affirmation.

There does run through the complaints about him the allegation that he does not make prudent judgments, that his behavior tends to alienate and upset people and get them unreasonably angry with him, and that, possibly, he does this to get their attention.

409473

CCI 006067

REDACTED

During an interview with him, the Archbishop mentioned that there is no place he could get the Personnel Board to recommend Mike for now, either as pastor or in any other capacity. I believe this to be the case and feel his reputation is such that the vast majority of priests in the Archdiocese would be nervous or fearful of working with him.

Incidentally, Father Mike has been going to see a psychologist for the past several years:

REDACTED^{or} REDACTED
REDACTED


Dr. REDACTED has said he would indeed be willing to send a report to Jemez Springs if needed and also willing to talk to one of the staff persons there if that would be helpful. He comes highly recommended by several priests in the Archdiocese.

In addition to the complaints about conflicts in rectories, there is another issue surrounding Father Wempe that tends to be more serious, although there is less hard evidence on it and I must admit that most of it is conjecture and rumor. However the rumors tend to be both consistent and persistent, and they deal with his relationship with small boys or with teenagers. It is true that he does--according to his own admission--spend much of his free time with minors. He has allowed these minors (we believe some of them may be as young as seven years old) to use firearms.

He has also had minors stay overnight in his present assignment. They spent the time in his room, and there are allegations that they spent time also in his bed. He has continued to have minors in his room, though not staying overnight, and specifically had one in his room after the Regional Bishop has asked the pastor to see that he did not do such a thing.

He has had a teenage boy live with him in a trailer during one of his assignments. There is also an allegation--and this one involves a specific person--that he did touch a person improperly a number of years ago, when the person was still a minor. Again, I would emphasize the existence of a consistent and persistent belief on the part of a number of priests that he has had improper and imprudent relationships with minors.

Because of concern about these relationships and because of his consistent inability to relate with other priests, the Archdiocese feels the time has come when he simply must have help if he is to continue to make use of the many talents he has and to minister fruitfully in the Archdiocese. I wish to be fair and candid in this assessment, and I would be most willing to elaborate on anything in this letter or speak to any of your staff persons if that were deemed useful.

Sincerely yours,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

409474

Exhibit 20

Letter of 23 December 1987
to Cardinal Mahony

409475



Jemez Springs, New Mexico 87025 (505) 829-3586

December 23, 1987

Most Reverend Roger Mahony, D.D.
Archbishop of Los Angeles
1531 West Ninth Street
Los Angeles, California 90015

Dear Archbishop Mahony,

REDACTED

3) Future ministry - for the time being, he needs to be in a situation which will allow him to avoid all contact with minors and also help him stay away from the opportunity for forming manipulative relationships with people who are relatively vulnerable. This does not only apply to minors and is not only a sexual matter, but fits into a pattern that Mike has been involved in various points in his life.

4) Conditions as set out in the meeting with Monsignor Tom Curry such as: no physical contact with minors except to shake hands, never being alone with minors, etc.

REDACTED

409476



REDACTED

Liam Hoare, S.P.
(Very Rev.) Liam J. Hoare, S.P., M.A., C.A.C.
Director of Foundation House

409477

CCI 006071

Exhibit 21

Letter of 6 January 1989
to Father Wempe

409478



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015-1194
(213) 251-3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
(213) 251-3284

January 6, 1989

Rev. Michael Wempe
St. Ambrose Church
1281 Fairfax Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Dear Mike:

Many thanks for coming to see me last week. In the course of our conversation, I mentioned that REDACTED had called me earlier in the year about a problem he had with you some time ago. I suggested he go to therapy and gave him the name of a therapist. Subsequently, the Archdiocese received and paid the enclosed bills.

In matters of sexual misconduct or other problems involving clergy, the Archdiocese is firm in maintaining that it is the responsibility of the priest involved to assist the injured party. Therefore, in instances such as this, we ask that the priest be responsible for the cost of the therapy. For this reason I am forwarding the enclosed bills to you and asking that you reimburse the Archdiocese in the amount of \$490.

The last bill was for June 28, 1988 so I assume therapy is not continuing. If there are further requests for assistance, I will be sure to contact you about them.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have need for further information.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

REDACTED

Enclosure

cc: Archbishop Mahohy

409479

Exhibit 22

Letter of 17 February 1989
to Father Wempe

409480



ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES

1531 WEST NINTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90015 1194
(213) 251 3200

OFFICE OF VICAR FOR CLERGY
(213) 251-3284

February 17, 1989

Rev. Michael Wempe
St. Ambros Church
1281 Fairfax Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Dear Mike:

I very much appreciate your bringing a check for \$490 to me last Wednesday.

While the amount may be small, the action does signify to me a continued willingness to commit yourself to your continued recovery.

Fraternally,

(Rev. Msgr.) Thomas J. Curry
Vicar for Clergy

<p>MICHAEL E. WEMPE REDACTED WEST HOLLYWOOD, CA 90046</p>		<p>1286</p>
<p>PAY TO THE ORDER OF <u>Roman Catholic Archdiocese of LA</u></p>		<p>2-15-89 16-4/1220</p>
<p><u>Four hundred ninety & no/10</u></p>		<p>\$ 490.00</p>
<p>REDACTED</p>		<p>DOLLARS</p>
<p>MEMO <u>1-6-89 coming</u></p>		<p><u>M. Wempe</u></p>
<p>REDACTED</p>		

Exhibit 23
Selected Press Reports

409482

Los Angeles Times

SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 2002

COPYRIGHT 2002/CC/144 PAGES

50¢

Mahony Regrets Transfer of Priest

By BETH SHUSTER
and RICHARD WINTON
TIMES STAFF WRITERS

Cardinal Roger M. Mahony said Friday he erred when he transferred a priest accused of molesting children to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center about 14 years ago without telling hospital officials about the allegations.

In his first public comments on a sex abuse case involving the Los Angeles Archdiocese, Mahony said he never should have assigned Father Michael Wempe to Cedars-Sinai without informing hospital officials that he had removed Wempe from his parish and ordered him to a New Mexico treatment facility for evaluation and counseling.

After the treatment, Mahony said, he was told Wempe could be trusted to work as a priest if he were in a supervised job without access to children. Mahony said he was told Wempe could serve in a prison or a hospital.

When he assigned Wempe to Cedars-Sinai, Mahony said, he did not know it had a pediatric unit.

"I think that was a mistake on our part then to not simply tell them of his background," Mahony told The Times. "That should have been done. I take responsibility for that."

In retrospect, Mahony said, he should have forced Wempe to immediately resign after hearing of the abuse allegations. "Fourteen years [later] is so different," said Mahony, who has headed the L.A. Archdiocese since 1985. "If that had been today, he would

Please see MAHONY, A19

RELATED STORY

Law won't quit: In a letter to priests, the cardinal makes it clear he'll stay on the job. **A14**

Los Angeles Times
News Article
Saturday, April 13, 2002

MAHONY: Cardinal Now Regrets Transfer of Priest

Continued from A1
have been out of the priesthood."

Mahony said he did not report Wempe's abuse allegations to police at the time. He assigned Wempe to Cedars-Sinai, where he worked from 1988 until last month, when Mahony forced him to retire under his recent "zero tolerance" policy against maintaining abusers in the church.

Mahony said he recently gave Wempe's name to the Los Angeles Police Department to review past allegations against him.

Wempe, 62, could not be reached for comment Friday. He had been living at a church parish attached to a school south of Hancock Park, according to a parish directory and interviews, but has since moved to Seal Beach.

Cedars-Sinai officials said they learned Friday about past allegations against Wempe. Grace Cheng, spokeswoman for Cedars-Sinai, said officials contacted the archdiocese earlier this week after inquiries from The Times. Representatives of the archdiocese met Friday with top officials of Cedars-Sinai.

"There were absolutely no complaints or claims or any issues of impropriety or misconduct" while Wempe was at the hospital, Cheng said.

Hospital officials described Wempe as well-liked. Mahony said he attended a luncheon in the chaplain's honor a couple of years ago. A retirement party scheduled for this month was canceled at Wempe's request, officials said.

"To the best of our knowledge . . . this particular priest was functioning very well and effectively," Mahony said. "As far as we know, there was never a hint" of any impropriety at the hospital.

On Wednesday, two brothers, now grown, filed a lawsuit in Orange County Superior Court alleging they had been sexually abused by Wempe from about 1976 to 1985. The suit also names the archdiocese, alleging that senior priests knew—or should have known—of Wempe's misconduct but failed to intervene.

Brothers Say Transfers Didn't Stop the Abuse

In an interview Friday with their attorney present, Mark and Lee Bashforth, who asked that their names be published, said the abuse began in a Ventura County parish and continued as Wempe was transferred to other area churches. Both men said they only recently remembered the abuse.

"I was 8 or 9 years old and I am staying in the rectory in his room overnight, where there is only one bed," said Lee Bashforth, 32.

Archdiocese officials had not seen the lawsuit and would not comment Friday.

Mahony said he believed a therapist Wempe saw in 1987 reported the case to authorities, but the cardinal was not certain. A source with knowledge of the case said allegations about Wempe were reported to the archdiocese in 1987 or 1988.

The Los Angeles Archdiocese is among a number of Roman Catholic ministries enmeshed in the widening sex abuse scandal. Recent and decades-old accusations of abuse by priests and others affiliated with the church began draw-



Archdiocese of Los Angeles 2002 Catholic Directory

Father Michael Wempe, seen in 1966 photo, was ordered to a treatment center in the 1980s.

ing national attention after highly-publicized cases in Boston earlier this year.

Los Angeles Times
News Article
Saturday, April 13, 2002
(continued)

409484

The Times reported in March that six to 12 priests had been dismissed by Mahony in February for past sexual abuse of minors. Mahony, under growing pressure to reveal details about the cases, would say only that "a few" priests, almost all of them retired, were involved.

On Friday, Mahony continued to refuse to name priests accused of sexual abuse, repeating earlier statements that he has been asked by two victims not to divulge the priests' names.

For the first time, however, Mahony clarified the number of known sex abuse cases. He said seven cases allegedly occurred before 1997, four in the last five years and another four were connected to priests who have since left the ministry and cannot be found. There were also a smaller group of allegedly abusive priests who are now dead, Mahony said.

In a 90-minute interview, conducted Friday afternoon in the residence receiving room of the new downtown cathedral, Mahony said the cases "gnaw" at him. He said he has trouble sleeping when he thinks about the victims.

"I keep reaffirming my own pledge to do everything in my power to make sure no one is harmed by the church," Mahony said. "That's what keeps me up at night: real sadness, sorrow, devastation."

Priest Was Trusted Friend of the Family

Mark Bashforth said that Wempe, who was a trusted family friend, began molesting him when he was 12. Then Wempe turned his attentions to Lee, who was 8, the brother's claim. They allege they were molested on overnight trips and during other activities.

Lee Bashforth said he recalled the abuse, which he had suppressed from his memory, about a month ago, watching coverage of the growing sex scandal. He said he had allowed Wempe to help officiate at his wedding ceremony last year.

"Do you think I'd let him anywhere near my wedding, if I had remembered?" Lee said.

After recalling the abuse, Lee Bashforth said, he called Mark, 39, and they began to sob together on the telephone.

"Because it such a traumatic memory, the mind does not let you recall these things," Mark Bashforth said. "[Wempe] gave a blessing in Lee's wedding ceremony. He did that knowing what he had done to my brother. How could he carry on this charade?"

R. Richard Farnell, a Newport Beach attorney representing the brothers, said Wempe had a history of abuse that was ignored by the archdiocese.

"The church concealed the truth about this priest for decades, moving him from parish to parish, without any thought for the children," Farnell said. "There are going to be other victims out there. A pedophile does not just do this once."

Los Angeles Times
News Article
Saturday, April 13, 2002
(continued)

SNAPHeadlines From Across the Nation

**News From
CALIFORNIA**

BACK TO:

[California Headlines](#)[SNAP Home](#)Los Angeles Times
latimes.com

Priest Held Again in Alleged Sex Abuse

Earlier charges against the former Cedars-Sinai chaplain were dismissed after a high court ruling. New allegations aren't affected by that decision.

By Richard Winton - LA Times
September 11, 2003

A retired Roman Catholic priest reassigned by Cardinal Roger M. Mahony to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center after the priest was accused of molesting boys in the 1980s was arrested Wednesday on suspicion of sexually abusing a child in his chaplain's office at the hospital from 1990 to 1995.

The Rev. Michael Wempe was one of 10 priests whose charges of sexual abuse were dismissed this summer after a U.S. Supreme Court decision invalidated the prosecution of decades-old molestation cases. The 63-year-old cleric had been charged in June with molesting five boys between 1977 and 1986 in Westlake Village, Palmdale and Ventura. He was released from jail this summer in the wake of the court ruling.

The new allegations, prosecutors said, cover a time period not affected by the high court decision.

The latest reported victim, now 24-years old, came forward only after hearing the other charges against Wempe had been dropped, authorities said. Wempe, who was arrested while eating breakfast at his Seal Beach retirement home, is being held in lieu of \$2-million bail.

Mary Grant, spokeswoman for the California chapter of Survivors Network for those Abused by Priests, said the latest allegations show the consequences of failing to fire and report abusive priests. "This cardinal transferred a priest who molested a new victim," she said.

After learning of the sex abuse allegations, Mahony ordered

Wempe to complete psychiatric treatment and then transferred Wempe to Cedars-Sinai in 1988. Mahony later acknowledged he should not have reassigned Wempe without telling hospital officials about the accusations. Instead, Mahony told The Times last year, he should have reported Wempe to police and forced him to immediately resign.

"There had been absolutely no allegations against Wempe following his therapy and during his longtime placement at Cedars-Sinai," said Tod Tamberg, the archdiocese spokesman. "We thought he was one of our success stories. If this allegation proves true, it will be a bitter disappointment."

Donald Steier, one of Wempe's attorneys, also expressed surprise.

"I am shocked. I cannot help but be suspicious of the timing of these allegations after the Supreme Court decision," he said, maintaining his client's innocence.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Sgt. Dan Scott of the Family Crimes Bureau, said the alleged victim was 11 when the abuse began in 1990. Wempe was a family friend, the victim told authorities, who allegedly molested him in a car and the chaplain's office, Scott said. The man was not a patient at the hospital at the time.

The alleged victim, who was not identified by authorities, came forward after the Supreme Court ruling, which has affected as many as 800 cases statewide and more than 200 in Los Angeles County. The high court decision voided a state law that gave prosecutors one year to file charges after they were notified of alleged sex crimes, regardless of when the crimes occurred. Prosecutors say that under the ruling they can file charges only for alleged abuse that happened after 1988.

Wempe's accuser told sheriff's investigators that he "was too ashamed to come forward earlier because he believed that Wempe would be convicted and sentenced on the testimony of the other victims," Scott said.

Cedars-Sinai officials said they first learned of abuse allegations against Wempe after he left the hospital last year.

"Based upon a review of our security records, we have confirmed there were no complaints or claims of misconduct regarding Father Wempe during the time he was assigned by L.A. Archdiocese to the hospital," said Grace Cheng, vice president of public relations.

Los Angeles Times
News Article
September 11, 2003
(continued)

Mahony forced Wempe to retire last year from the Cedars chaplaincy and from the active clergy, along with six other accused priests, as he retroactively applied a zero-tolerance policy for sex abusers in the Los Angeles Archdiocese.

Mahony told The Times he had ordered Wempe to a New Mexico treatment facility after the allegations in the 1980s. After treatment, Mahony said, experts told him that Wempe could be trusted to work in a place without access to children, such as a jail or hospital. Mahony said he was unaware that Cedars had a pediatric unit. Mahony said he did not report the abuse allegations to police until last year. He said he thought a therapist who treated Wempe in the 1980s had reported it earlier.

Other alleged victims of Wempe said Wednesday that the arrest showed how the L.A. Archdiocese acted like the Boston Archdiocese under former Cardinal Bernard Law — transferring pedophiles who continued to abuse children.

"Mahony and Bernard Law were reading from the same operating manual," said Lee Bashforth, 33, an alleged victim of Wempe during the 1970s. "They sacrificed young people to these sexual predators."

Bashforth and his brother were ages 8 and 12, respectively, when, he alleged, Wempe began abusing them at the Westlake Village parish of St. Jude where they served as altar boys. Bashforth was among the five alleged victims Wempe was accused of molesting in June.

"I am just so sorry this had to happen, you know, that these kinds of things happened," Wempe said after he was released the following month. "I'm happy that it's been dismissed."

Wempe's church personnel files were among those demanded by the Los Angeles County Grand Jury. The archdiocese has fought the release of documents reflecting communications between top church officials and priests, claiming it would violate their civil rights.

Los Angeles County Dist. Atty. Steve Cooley said the Wempe case "underscores the importance of ongoing litigation with the Los Angeles Archdiocese relative to records sought as criminal evidence in allegations of priests abusing children."

Los Angeles Times
News Article
September 11, 2003
(continued)

Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests
www.snapnetwork.org

Los Angeles Times
News Article
September 11, 2003

Priest Held in Alleged Sex Abuse

Earlier charges against the former Cedars-Sinai chaplain were dismissed after a high court ruling. New allegations aren't affected by that decision.

By RICHARD WINTON
Times Staff Writer

A retired Roman Catholic priest reassigned by Cardinal Roger M. Mahony to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center after the priest was accused of molesting boys in the 1980s was arrested Wednesday on suspicion of sexually abusing a child in his chaplain's office at the hospital from 1990 to 1995.

The Rev. Michael Wempe was one of 10 priests whose charges of sexual abuse were dismissed this summer after a U.S. Supreme Court decision invalidated the prosecution of decades-old molestation cases. The 63-year-old cleric had been charged in June with molesting five boys between 1977 and 1986 in Westlake Village, Palmdale and Ventura. He was released from jail this summer in the wake of the court ruling.

The new allegations, prosecutors said, cover a time period not affected by the high court deci-



IN CUSTODY Michael Wempe was transferred to Cedars-Sinai in 1980s after he was accused of molesting boys.

The latest reported victim, now 24 years old, came forward only after hearing the other charges against Wempe had been dropped, authorities said. Wempe, who was arrested while eating breakfast at his Seal Beach retirement home, is being held in lieu of \$2-million bail.

Marie Grant, spokeswoman for the California chapter of Survivors Network for those Abused by Priests, said the latest allegations show the consequences of failing to fire and report abusive priests. This cardinal transferred a priest who molested a new victim, she said.

After learning of the sex abuse allegations, Mahony ordered Wempe to complete psychiatric treatment and then transferred Wempe to Cedars-Sinai in 1988. Mahony later acknowledged he should not have reassigned Wempe without telling hospital officials about the accusations. Instead, Mahony told the Times last year, he should have reported Wempe to police and forced him to immediately resign.

There had been absolutely no allegations against Wempe following his departure and during his longtime placement at Cedars-Sinai, said Rod Lambert, the archdiocese spokesman. "We thought he was one of our success stories. If this allegation proves true, it will be a terrible disappointment."

Donald Steier, one of Wempe's attorneys, also expressed surprise.

"I am shocked. I cannot help but be suspicious of the timing of

Los Angeles Times
News Article
September 11, 2003
(continued)

Priest Arrested for Alleged Sex Abuse

[Priest, from Page B1]
maintaining his client's innocence.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Sgt. Dan Scott of the Family Crimes Bureau, said the alleged victim was 11 when the abuse began in 1990. Wempe was a family friend, the victim told authorities, who allegedly molested him in a car and the chaplain's office, Scott said. The man was not a patient at the hospital at the time.

The alleged victim, who was not identified by authorities, came forward after the Supreme Court ruling, which has affected as many as 800 cases statewide and more than 200 in Los Angeles County. The high court decision voided a state law that

gave prosecutors one year to file charges after they were notified of alleged sex crimes, regardless of when the crimes occurred. Prosecutors say that under the ruling they can file charges only for alleged abuse that happened after 1988.

Wempe's accuser told sheriff's investigators that he "was too ashamed to come forward earlier because he believed that Wempe would be convicted and sentenced on the testimony of the other victims," Scott said.

Cedars-Sinai officials said they first learned of abuse allegations against Wempe after he left the hospital last year.

"Based upon a review of our security records, we have confirmed there were no complaints or claims of misconduct regarding Father Wempe during the time he was assigned by L.A. Archdiocese to the hospital," said Grace Cheng, vice president of public relations.

Mahony forced Wempe to retire last year from the Cedars-Sinai "chaplaincy and from the active clergy, along with six other accused priests, as he retroactively

applied a zero-tolerance policy for sex abusers in the Los Angeles Archdiocese.

Mahony told The Times he had ordered Wempe to a New Mexico treatment facility after the allegations in the 1980s. After treatment, Mahony said, experts told him that Wempe could be trusted to work in a place without access to children, such as a jail or hospital. Mahony said he was unaware that Cedars had a pediatric unit. Mahony said he did not report the abuse allegations to police until last year. He said he thought a therapist who treated Wempe in the 1980s had reported it earlier.

Other alleged victims of Wempe said Wednesday that the arrest showed how the L.A. Archdiocese acted like the Boston Archdiocese under former Cardinal Bernard Law — transferring pedophiles who continued to abuse children.

"Mahony and Bernard Law were reading from the same operating manual," said 33, an alleged victim of Wempe during the 1970s. "They sacrificed young people to these


sexual predators," and his brother were ages 8 and 12, respectively, when, he alleged, Wempe began abusing them at the Westlake Village parish of St. Jude where they served as altar boys.

Wempe was among the five alleged victims Wempe was accused of molesting in June.

"I am just so sorry this had to happen, you know, that these kinds of things happened," Wempe said after he was released the following month. "I'm happy that it's been dismissed."

Wempe's church personnel files were among those demanded by the Los Angeles County Grand Jury. The archdiocese has fought the release of documents reflecting communications between top church officials and priests, claiming it would violate their civil rights.

Los Angeles County District Attorney Steve Cooley said the Wempe case "underscores the importance of ongoing litigation with the Los Angeles Archdiocese relative to records sought as criminal evidence in allegations of priests abusing children."



I got the job because
Careambler.com did the
searching for me.

Careambler.com
The smarter way to find a better job.

Former priest arrested for allegedly molesting California boy

Associated Press

LOS ANGELES - A former Roman Catholic priest was arrested Wednesday for allegedly molesting a boy in the 1990s, following his release after 42 similar charges were recently dropped against him.

Michael Wempe, 63, was booked for investigation of child molestation and was being held on \$2 million bail, sheriff's Sgt. Dan Scott said. Wempe is scheduled to be arraigned Thursday.

The earlier charges were dropped in June, after the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a law that erased the statute of limitations on decades-old molestation cases.

Scott said the alleged victim in the latest case, now an adult, thought Wempe would be convicted of the original charges but decided to step forward after that case was dismissed because he feared Wempe would go free, Scott said.

More than 800 child molestation cases were ordered dismissed in California after the ruling, but the court's decision did not affect cases that occurred after 1988.

Wempe's lawyer Donald Steier said the timing was suspicious because it came so close to the Supreme Court's decision.

"We find the allegations shocking, and I find the timing of this entire affair to be highly suspect," Steier said. He said the allegations may have been made in reaction to the court's decision.

"A lot of people were angry," he said.

The alleged victim said the molestation began when he was 11 and lasted from 1990 to 1995, authorities said. Wempe was a family friend and a popular chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, where some of the alleged molestations took place.

"If this allegation proves to be true, this is a terrible disappointment. These are serious charges" said Tod Tamberg, spokesman for the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. "Frankly, we thought father Wempe was one of our success stories."

Wempe was treated 15 years ago after allegations surfaced of sexual misconduct. He was later transferred to work in a supervised role and was to have no access to children, according to the archdiocese.

"He was placed at Cedars-Sinai for a very long time with absolutely no complaints," Tamberg said. "He was placed in a ministry that it was recommended would be appropriate for him."

Wempe was first arrested in May and charged with molesting five boys, ages 7 to 15, between the mid 1970s to the mid 1980s in Los Angeles, Ventura and San Diego counties. Wempe maintains his innocence in that case.

The nation's largest archdiocese has about 5 million members in 120 cities covering Santa Barbara, Ventura and Los Angeles counties.

Associated Press
News Article

409491

CCI 006085

Daily Journal
New Article
September 11, 2003

SEPTEMBER 11, 2003 | CRIMINAL

Print | Email
Reprint rights

Police Arrest Freed Priest in New Sex Case
Police Arrest Freed Priest on Sex Charge

By Jeffrey Anderson and Anne LaJeunesse
Daily Journal Staff Writers

LOS ANGELES - Retired Roman Catholic priest Michael Wempe, who walked out of jail this summer after the U.S. Supreme Court gutted church sex-abuse investigations in California, was arrested Wednesday on new charges of molesting a child while serving as chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Hospital, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department said.

The alleged victim came forward after learning that Wempe had been released because of the Supreme Court ruling, which in June struck down the child-molestation statute that prosecutors were using to go after sexual-abuse crimes that were otherwise time-barred, sheriff's Sgt. Dan Scott, the arresting officer, said.

"He had held it in out of embarrassment, but when he saw that Wempe was going to be released from the previous charges, he decided to come forward," Scott said.

Wempe was arrested without incident at 7 a.m. at his Leisure World home in Seal Beach and booked on suspicion of child molestation, Scott said. He is being held at Los Angeles County Jail in lieu of \$2 million bail.

His alleged victim, a male in his early 20s who has asked to remain anonymous, claims Wempe molested him from 1990 to 1995, beginning when he was 11, Scott said.

The alleged molestations took place in a car and on the premises of Cedars-Sinai Hospital, where Wempe served as a chaplain from 1988 until his forced retirement in 2002.

Cardinal Roger Mahony became aware of molestation claims against Wempe in 1986, a representative of Mahony said. But after a period of treatment and rehabilitation, which also took place at Cedars-Sinai, Wempe was restored by Mahony to the ministry in 1988. *Canon*

In 2002, Wempe, along with several other Los Angeles priests, was forced to retire as additional claims of sexual abuse began to surface.

"I can't tell you how disappointed I am with Wempe," J. Michael Hennigan, attorney for the Los Angeles Archdiocese, said. "We had believed and hoped that he was rehabilitated."

"We received glowing reports from Cedars about his progress. He wouldn't even go near the pediatric ward there."

"I'm with [the archdiocese] on this," said Donald Steler, whose firm, Guzin & Steler, represents Wempe in both criminal and civil court. "But I have real questions about this. I've interviewed Wempe extensively."

"I'm suspicious of the time period which is being alleged," Steler said. "Wempe was in group therapy and receiving aftercare at the time."

"I'm shocked and surprised."

Wempe is to be arraigned today at the Criminal Courts Building in downtown Los Angeles.

The alleged victim was not a patient at the hospital, according to Hennigan.

"Based on discussions with the district attorney, my understanding is that Wempe is a friend of the family," Hennigan said. "I have an idea of who it is, but I can't be sure."

Wempe was released June 27 from Los Angeles County Jail, the day after the Supreme Court ruling in *Stogner v. California*. He had been charged with 42 counts involving the alleged molestation of five boys between 1976 and 1985. Wempe, who attended seminary at St. John's Seminary in Camarillo, was associate pastor and parochial vicar at St. Jude Church in Westlake Village and Sacred Heart Church in Ventura County from 1973 to 1978, and a resident in active service at St. Mary Church in Palmdale, from 1978 to 1984.

Two brothers, who are among the original five alleged victims, are suing Wempe in Los Angeles civil court.

Following the Supreme Court decision, prosecutors around the state were forced to dismiss pending criminal cases and abandon many investigations.

Daily Journal
New Article
September 11, 2003
(continued)

Los Angeles prosecutors dismissed all 11 of the criminal cases they had filed in the last year. If Wempe is charged, his case will be the first new filing in Los Angeles since the Supreme Court decision that crippled law enforcers and prosecutors and left victims around the state in despair.

Following Wempe's arrest Wednesday, District Attorney Steve Cooley released a statement.

"The re-arrest of Michael Wempe will restore the faith of victims shattered by the recent Supreme Court decision," Cooley wrote.

On Wednesday, law enforcers in neighboring counties said they were upset over watching accused molesters go free. But they expressed hope that Wempe's re-arrest will spark a revival of their own investigations.

"We are not currently investigating any priests in connection with alleged sex crimes," said Lieutenant Steve Szabo with the Orange County Sheriff's Department sex crimes unit. "We had made several arrests, but due to the Supreme Court decision, we had to let them go."

"It's sickening, because these guys were guilty," said Orange County Deputy District Attorney Rosanne Froeberg, head of the sexual assault unit.

Following the high-court ruling in June, Froeberg's office was forced to dismiss cases against three Catholic priests and one Protestant minister, she said.

One priest, the Rev. Siegfried Widera, who had been charged with sexual molestation of a minor but whose case would have been dismissed, jumped from a building to his death in Mazatlan just before the landmark ruling, Froeberg added.

Prosecutors in Ventura County were forced to dismiss pending cases and abandon their ongoing criminal investigations of numerous others, according to sources in that office.

"We were clubbed to death by that Supreme Court case, and 99 percent of what we were working on has dried up," said one prosecutor, who asked to remain anonymous.

"Getting the focus back on these cases is important," Froeberg said. "Since the Supreme Court decision, it has been pretty quiet, but it's not like priests stopped molesting children."

"We can't predict if, or how many, people might come forward now, but we've asked law enforcers to take down reports on older crimes that can't be prosecuted, because we can obtain corroborating information that helps us resurrect other older cases, or are able to prosecute more recent ones."

Scott added, "We still are actively investigating other cases, including the ones that were dismissed. Something like this could happen where a new victim comes forward."

"We're still out there digging."

© 2003 Daily Journal Corporation. All rights reserved.

Former child victim testifies in priest abuse case
Associated Press

172

LOS ANGELES - A 24-year-old man testified Monday that a retired Roman Catholic priest who once served as the chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center fondled him on several occasions from 1990 to 1995.

The testimony against the Rev. Michael Wempe, 63, was part of hearing to determine if the case should be sent to trial. He faces three counts of a lewd act on a child and one count of oral copulation of a person under 16.

Wempe was charged last June with molesting five boys, ages 7 to 15, between 1977 and 1986 in Los Angeles, Ventura and San Diego counties.

Wempe never had to stand trial for those alleged crimes when the nation's high court struck down a California law that erased the statute of limitations on sexual abuses cases from 1988 and earlier.

The priest was nonetheless forced into retirement in 2002 and is not allowed to perform priestly functions.

He was arrested again in September after the man came forward with allegations that he was molested by Wempe over a five-year period.

The man testified that Wempe was a family friend who had also allegedly molested his two brothers. He said Wempe fondled him and left him feeling "embarrassed, ashamed."

The man decided to tell authorities about the alleged crimes after he learned Wempe was freed from jail and would only be accountable if he revealed what had happened.

"I realized that justice was too big a price to pay for my secret," the man said.

Associated Press
News Article

409494

CCI 006088

LOS ANGELES TIMES

SF TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2004 B11

Man Tells of Being Molested by Priest

[Priest, from Page B1]

played on a computer. The priest made it seem normal, he said, and told him it "sometimes feels good." He testified that the priest abused him three more times in his car.

When he realized Wempe's actions were inappropriate, the man testified he became "absolutely disgusted" and horrified.

"I knew what happened was wrong," he said. "I was sick to my stomach."

Despite that, the man said, he didn't tell his family or the police. Even after his brothers filed a lawsuit alleging that Wempe molested them, he continued to keep quiet.

"I was embarrassed, ashamed," he testified. "I just wanted it to go away.... I promised myself just to bury it and keep it a secret for the rest of my life."

He decided to come forward, he testified, after the earlier charges against Wempe, based in part on his brothers' allegations, were dropped.

"I changed my mind when I realized

that the only thing that would ensure justice was if I got involved," he said. "I realized that justice was too big a price to pay for my secret."

Wempe was among seven priests in the Los Angeles Archdiocese whom Mahony forced into retirement in 2002 as the sexual abuse scandal escalated. He was ordained in 1966 and worked at St. Jude parish in Westlake Village beginning in 1974, where the two brothers alleged that Wempe molested them on overnight trips and in his room.

The brothers alleged that Wempe continued to abuse them despite his transfer to other parishes.

Mahony acknowledged that after learning of earlier allegations, he transferred Wempe from St. Jude to a chaplain's job at Cedars-Sinai.

Mahony later said he should have forced Wempe to resign immediately at that time.

He said he had been told that Wempe could be trusted to work in a place without access to children.



GARY FRIEDMAN Los Angeles Times
ACCUSED: Michael Wempe, left, confers with attorney Donald Steter in court last year.

Los Angeles Times

News Article

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

409495

CCI 006089

Tuesday, February 10, 2004

latimes.com/california

Man Tells Court of Sex Abuse

The accuser, saying he was confused and disgusted, testifies that retired priest Michael Wempe molested him over several years.

By ANNA GORMAN
Times Staff Writer

A former Roman Catholic priest whom Cardinal Roger M. Mahony said he erred in transferring after allegations of sexual abuse faced his newest accuser Monday in Los Angeles County Superior Court.

The 24-year-old man testified that Michael Wempe molested him as a child in the priest's car and in his office at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. Wiping his eyes and sighing deeply, he said he was confused and disgusted.

As Wempe fondled him, he testified, the priest and close

"I didn't know why he would be doing something that was wrong," he testified.

Wempe, 64, sat quietly in his orange jail jumpsuit as he listened to the testimony in his preliminary hearing, which will determine if there is enough evidence for a trial. His attorney said Wempe faces at least 20 years in prison if convicted.

The retired priest has pleaded not guilty and is being held in lieu of \$500,000 bail. One of Wempe's attorneys, Leonard B. Levine, said his client "adamantly denies" the allegations.

The Times does not name victims of sexual abuse.

Over two hours, the man testified that Wempe molested him from age 11 to 15. His mother arranged for him to spend time with Wempe because she wanted him to have some guidance from an adult male.

Wempe also spent time with the man's two older brothers, he testified. Both men have also accused Wempe of molesting them.

Wempe was criminally charged with molesting both brothers and three other children, but the charges were dropped last summer after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that California's attempt to prosecute older cases of child molestation was unconstitutional.

Noting that Wempe had baptized him, the man testified Monday, "I had no reason not to trust him."

He testified that he twice went with Wempe to Cedars-Sinai, where the priest sat him on his lap and fondled him while he

[See Priest, Page B11]

Los Angeles Times
News Article

Tuesday, February 10, 2004
(continued)

Los Angeles Times
News Article
Tuesday, February 19, 2004

Ex-Priest Ordered to Trial in Sex Abuse Case

Judge rules that enough
evidence exists for
Michael Wempe to face
molestation charges.

By ANNA GORMAN
Times Staff Writer

A judge Wednesday ordered retired Roman Catholic priest Michael Wempe, accused of repeated child abuse, to stand trial on charges of sexually molesting a boy between 1990 and 1995.

Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Jacob Adajian ruled after a weeklong hearing that there was enough evidence against Wempe, 64, for a trial. He faces the possibility of more than 20 years in prison if convicted.

The alleged victim, now 24, testified that Wempe molested him in the priest's car and in his office at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. Two other alleged victims also testified that Wempe molested them.

Cardinal Roger M. Mahony of the Los Angeles Archdiocese has acknowledged that after learning of earlier abuse allegations against Wempe, he sent the priest for treatment and then transferred him to a chaplain job at Cedars-Sinai. In retrospect, Mahony has said, he should have forced Wempe to resign.

Charges that Wempe earlier molested the alleged victim's two older brothers and three others were dismissed last year after the U.S. Supreme Court invalidated the prosecution of decades-old molestation cases. The former priest was one of 10 whose Los Angeles County cases were thrown out. He was re-arrested when the youngest brother came forward and alleged that he had been molested more recently.

"The defendant's crimes are terrible," said Deputy Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks. "They are sinful."

But one of Wempe's defense attorneys, Leonard B. Levine, attacked the credibility of the alleged victim in this case, accusing him of making up the allegations to seek revenge for his two older brothers. One of the brothers told a reporter after the Supreme Court ruling that he could understand people taking justice into their own hands.

"It's clear from the evidence that these allegations were likely fabricated," Levine said outside court.

In 1974, Wempe started working at St. Jude parish in Westlake Village, where the alleged victim's two older brothers claimed that Wempe molested them on overnight trips and in his parish room. In 2002, the brothers filed a lawsuit in which they alleged that Wempe had continued to abuse them despite transfers to other parishes.

According to a report released by Mahony this week, Wempe was accused of molesting 13 youths from 1972 to 1995. He is being held in lieu of \$500,000 bail in county jail.

Los Angeles Times
News Article
Tuesday, February 20, 2004

4 Priests Who Avoided Old Charges Facing Prosecution Anew

By RICHARD WINTON
Times Staff Writer

Four of 10 priests who escaped sexual abuse charges in Los Angeles County last summer after a U.S. Supreme Court decision are facing new charges of sexual abuse.

One former priest faces life in prison in Texas if convicted, two more are awaiting sentencing, and the fourth is awaiting trial on new charges.

"One by one, these guys are going down," said Los Angeles County Deputy Dist. Atty. William Hodgman. "If they struck once, they tend to strike again."

The U.S. Supreme Court struck down the 1994 California law allowing the retroactive prosecution of decades-old child sex crimes. But the state attorney general's office has concluded that crimes that occurred after Jan. 1, 1988, are still prosecutable.

Michael Wempe faces trial on allegations that he sexually abused a boy in his hospital chapel's office as recently as

1995. Earlier, molestation charges against Wempe were dropped last summer. He was forced to retire from the ministry in 2002.

John Anthony Salazar was charged with sexually assaulting an 18-year-old in a Texas hotel room last September, six months after charges were dismissed against him for molesting two boys in the 1980s at an Eastside Los Angeles parish. Salazar, who was working as a priest at the time of the alleged assault, has since been removed from the ministry.

Lawrence Lovell, who has been removed from the priesthood, is awaiting sentencing in Prescott, Ariz., for molesting a 13-year-old boy there in the late 1970s. Charges that Lovell abused four altar boys at the San Gabriel Mission from 1980 to 1984 were dropped last year after the high court decision.

Carlos Rene Rodriguez faces 10 years in prison after pleading guilty to molesting two boys at a Santa Paula parish from 1988 to 1993. Rodriguez was

arrested in December, five months after charges that he molested a Los Angeles altar boy in the 1980s were dismissed. He has been removed from the ministry.

Hodgman, the L.A. County prosecutor, said his office is continuing to pursue charges against the 10 priests.

"We haven't finished yet in Los Angeles," he said. "I can say, we expect to charge some of these guys again. It's far from over."

On Wednesday, the 64-year-old Wempe was ordered to stand trial for allegedly molesting a boy, now age 24, as recently as 1995 — a year within the new window of prosecution.

The alleged victim came forward last fall after publicity over the dismissal of charges against Wempe that he molested two brothers in the 1970s — crimes too old to prosecute under the high court ruling.

Wempe is charged with molesting the boy between 1990 and 1995 in his car and chapel's office at Cedars-Sinai Medical

served nearly three years of a six-year prison sentence.

After he was assigned to a church-run New Mexico treatment facility for sexually abusive priests, he was hired by the Diocese of Amarillo in Texas in 1991.

Salazar was a parish priest at the Church of the Holy Spirit in Trulla, Texas, until April 2002 when he was forced out of the ministry by Bishop John Yanta. The diocese cut off financial assistance for him in September after the latest allegations, said Cathy Lexa, diocese spokeswoman.

Blackmon said it was in Trulla that Salazar met the man he allegedly assaulted. Sept. 21, as they stayed at the Days Inn in Irving, Texas, for a wedding. The assault allegedly occurred about 2:30 a.m. after the man, feeling sick, was helped to his room by Salazar. The man reported it the next day to the Amarillo Diocese, which contacted police.

Salazar is being held at the Dallas County Jail in lieu of \$500,000 bail. His attorney has

denied the charges.

Lovell was convicted of molesting a boy in the San Gabriel Mission in 1986 and subsequently left the ministry.

New charges that Lovell abused four additional altar boys at the San Gabriel Mission from 1980 to 1984 were dropped last year after the Supreme Court decision.

He pleaded guilty recently to molesting a boy in Prescott, Ariz., in 1985 and is awaiting sentencing.

A Maricopa County grand jury indicted him last month for fondling an altar boy at Sacred Heart parish in Phoenix from July 1984 to May 1985, said Bill FitzGerald, spokesman for the Maricopa County district attorney.

Lovell faces a prison term of five to 15 years at sentencing, according to the plea.

In Ventura County, Carlos Rodriguez, 48, pleaded guilty to molesting two boys while serving at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church in Santa Paula from 1983 to 1993.

Daily Journal
New Article
June 8, 2004

JUNE 8, 2004 | CRIMINAL

[Print](#) | [Email](#)
[Reprint rights](#)

Church Refuses to Relinquish Files on Priest

By Joy C. Shaw

Daily Journal Staff Writer

LOS ANGELES - The Los Angeles Roman Catholic Archdiocese is refusing to turn over secret church files sought by the Los Angeles County district attorney in the child-molestation prosecution of retired priest Michael Wempe, attorneys said Monday.

Church lawyers said they plan to file a motion today to quash the district attorney's subpoena for the files. The motion will cite an array of church privileges, including the right to privacy, the First Amendment protection of freedom of religion, and the priest-penitent, psychotherapist-patient and attorney-client privileges.

"The archdiocese is filing a motion for the purpose of protecting confidential communications between the bishops of Los Angeles and their priests," said Donald Woods, attorney for the Los Angeles Archdiocese.

Deputy District Attorney R. Todd Hicks, said he is disappointed by the archdiocese's decision and plans to object.

The church last year resisted turning over documents in a grand-jury investigation of 10 other accused molester priests. The investigation was aborted by a U.S. Supreme Court decision striking down a California law that had extended the statute of limitations to file charges against abusive priests.

Wempe was charged earlier this year with four counts of child molestation for allegedly improperly touching and sodomizing a teenage boy between 1990 and 1994. The allegations are well within the normal statute of limitation. *People v. Wempe*, BA253178 (L.A. Super. Ct., filed Sept. 11, 2003).

Hicks said his office issued a subpoena May 27, asking for all church records involving Michael Wempe, who retired from ministry in 2002. They include the archdiocese's secret archives, personnel files, investigative files, memoranda, correspondence, interviews, evaluations, insurance policies or contracts, records of payment and confidential settlement agreements, Hicks said.

Since the recent explosion of clergy abuse charges in 2002, the Los Angeles Archdiocese has succeeded in keeping its confidential church files away from prosecutors, civil attorneys and the public limelight.

The full legal arguments about the church's duties and claimed privileges also have remained shrouded, because of either grand-jury secrecy or closed-door settlement negotiations.

Wempe's has denied he sexually abused the boy, and his attorney Donald Steier has asked retired Judge Samuel Mayerson, sitting on assignment, to throw out the case.

Steier argued that Wempe's preliminary hearing earlier this year was flawed. The lawyer said the prosecution of old sex-abuse cases is unconstitutional.

A hearing is scheduled this morning in the downtown courthouse in front of Mayerson.

Attorneys say Mayerson likely will decide whether to dismiss the case or set a trial date on Tuesday.

But the judge is not expected to rule immediately on the church's motion to quash.

Woods said his motion to quash will be "virtually identical" to one that persuaded a Ventura County judge last year to seal records sought in a grand-jury investigation of clergy sexual abuse.

Woods added that "the principle" of confidentiality between priests and their bishops is essential in the practice of Roman Catholic faith.

"[Priests and bishops] have a very confidential relationship similar to a father and a son or spouses," Woods said. "That relationship we would like to see protected, ... and we do not believe it's necessary for the people to have these communications about the discussions in order to prosecute this priest."

John Manly, a Costa Mesa attorney who represents many alleged clergy abuse victims in civil court in Southern California, said Mayerson's decision on the subpoena would be closely watched.

Manly accused the church of unethical conduct in withholding the files.

"It's the most nonsensical, outrageous, un-American thing to tell someone that they are going to create some privileges to keep the documents secret," he said.

© 2004 Daily Journal Corporation. All rights reserved.

Daily Journal
New Article
June 8, 2004
(continued)

Daily Journal
New Article
June 9, 2004

JUNE 9, 2004 | CRIMINAL

[Print](#) | [Email](#)
[Reprint rights](#)

Archdiocese Delays Motion on Priest Files

LOS ANGELES - The Los Angeles Archdiocese is putting off the filing of a planned motion to quash a subpoena for confidential church files until a judge decides its former priest ~~Michael Wempe~~ charged with child molestation, must face trial.

Retired Superior Court Judge Samuel Mayerson, sitting on assignment, on Tuesday continued a pre-trial hearing to June 25 so the prosecutors and the attorneys representing Wempe would have ample time to address the strengths and weaknesses of the case.

Donald Steier, attorney representing Wempe, had asked the judge to throw out the case because, he said, information from the pre-trial hearing was flawed. He also said the district attorney's interpretation of the statute of limitations, which they used to prosecute Wempe in the case, is unconstitutional. But R. Todd Hicks, deputy district attorney, asked the judge to deny the request in a written response filed Monday.

The district attorney's office had subpoenaed confidential church files related to Wempe, which, Hicks said, is necessary to prosecute the former priest's molestation charges.

Donald Woods, attorney representing the Los Angeles Archdiocese, had refused to turn over the church files sought by the district attorney, citing an array of privileges that include rights to privacy and the constitutional protection of freedom of religion.

The church had planned to file a motion to quash the subpoena Tuesday but is waiting for the outcome of the June 25 hearing, when Mayerson will decide either to throw out the case or set a trial date. If Wempe's attorneys succeed in dismissing the case, the church will have no need to respond to the district attorney's subpoena, Woods said.

- Joy Shaw

© 2004 Daily Journal Corporation. All rights reserved.

Daily Journal
New Article
June 28, 2004

JUNE 28, 2004 | CRIMINAL

[Print](#) | [Email](#)
[Reprint rights](#)

Former Priest Must Face Trial for Molestation, Judge Says

By Joy C. Shaw

Daily Journal Staff Writer

LOS ANGELES - A former Catholic priest must face criminal prosecution for allegedly molesting a minor between 1990 and 1995, a judge ruled Friday.

Retired judge Samuel Mayerson, sitting on assignment, ruled there was enough evidence presented at a preliminary hearing to hold Michael Wempe for trial.

Mayerson also rejected contentions by Wempe's defense attorney that the charges should be thrown out because they fall outside the three-year statute of limitations for filing molestation charges. *People v. Wempe*, BA253178 (L.A. Super. Ct., filed Sept. 11, 2003)

Prosecutors said under California Penal Code Section 803(g), molestation charges can be filed within a year of the accuser coming forward, no matter how long ago the abuse allegedly occurred.

"We are very pleased with the judge's decision today," said deputy district attorney R. Todd Hicks, adding that state and federal law has had a long history in extending statute of limitation in prosecution of serious crimes. "I think the law is quite clear in this area."

Donald Steier, attorney representing Wempe, however, said extending the statute is a "gray area" in California law, and vowed to challenge the district attorney's use of a 803(g) if Wempe is convicted.

"Our legal argument, we feel, is very strong but politics is against us," Steier said after Friday's hearing.

Last June, the U.S. Supreme Court, said 803(g) can't be applied retroactively, and it threw out hundreds of sexual abuse cases across the state. *Stogner v. California*, 2003 DJDAR 6989 (U.S. Sct. June 26, 2003).

The decision forced Los Angeles district attorney to abandon prosecution of decades-old sex crimes - including those allegedly committed by several Catholic priests.

Leonard Levine, another attorney for Wempe, said he wasn't surprised by the judge's ruling Friday given the low standard of proof the prosecution must offer at a preliminary hearing.

"We think when proven beyond a reasonable doubt as required then the prosecution will fall well short of that standard," Levine said.

"We are still confident that when this case comes to trial [Wempe] will be totally exonerated of all these charges."

The alleged victim, Jayson B., now 25, reported the molestation to the police in August 2003 after learning that Wempe would be released from jail because of the *Stogner* decision. Wempe had been under investigation for earlier child molestation claims made by two of Jason's older brothers.

Meanwhile, Judge Mayerson put off until Aug. 2 a hearing on whether the Los Angeles Archdiocese must turn over confidential documents related to Wempe.

Attorneys for the archdiocese had declined to turn over any document subpoenaed by the district attorney in the Wempe case, claiming they are privileged.

© 2004 Daily Journal Corporation. All rights reserved.

Jailed Priest Accused of Molesting Sees Bail Lowered

Michael Wempe will be freed if he agrees not to perform priestly duties and wears an electronic monitor. He faces 20 years on charges.

By JEAN GUCCIONE
Times Staff Writer

The only Roman Catholic priest still jailed for allegedly molesting children in Los Angeles County could be out next week if he posts a newly reduced bail and promises not to perform priestly functions while awaiting trial.

Instead of a passport, lawyers for Michael Edwin Wempe offered to surrender his clerical collar Friday.

The 64-year-old retired priest is expected to come up with the \$100,000 bond within the next few days and return to the Seal Beach retirement home he

shared with his ailing mother until his arrest in September.

A judge reduced Wempe's bail from \$500,000, warning that if he flees, his action would be considered "virtually an admission of guilt."

Retired Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Samuel Mayerson also ordered Wempe to wear an electronic device to monitor his whereabouts.

He must stay inside his house except to see his doctors and lawyers, shop for groceries and attend Mass — which the judge warned he could do so only as a participant, not the celebrant.

Deputy Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks, who opposed the bail reduction, said he was disappointed with the ruling.

In court, he said Wempe, who faces up to 20 years in prison, might be tempted to run based on the strength of the evidence presented against him at a week-long preliminary hearing in February. He also said he feared the priest would abuse again.

But Wempe's lawyers, Leonard Levine and Donald Steier, successfully argued that the cleric was neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community.

Defense lawyers said he hasn't fled during a lengthy and open police investigation. Last summer, Wempe was charged with 42 counts of sexually molesting 13 boys between 1977 and 1988.

A few days later, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a 1994 California law allowing retroactive prosecution involving older sex crimes against children. As a result, criminal charges against Wempe and nine other priests were dismissed.

In the current case, prosecutors allege Wempe molested a boy in his chaplain's office at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center between 1990 and 1995.

The victim did not report his allegations until earlier charges against Wempe — involving the victim's older brother — were dismissed.

One of the victim's brother compared the judge's decision allowing Wempe to live in a retirement home where grandchildren come to visit their relative to Cardinal Roger M. Mahony's decision to place Wempe in a hospital with a pediatric ward after he was removed from his church parish amid allegation of child molestation.

Mahony forced Wempe to retire from the priesthood in 2002 and barred him from active ministry. Wempe's defense lawyer said. Yet Wempe nodded yes when Mayerson asked his lawyers Friday if he was still a priest.

Wempe is one of two retired priests facing child molestation charges in Los Angeles County. The other, Stephen Charles Hernandez, posted \$240,000 bail after he was arrested in June. He faces 12 felony counts involving 14-year-old boy he allegedly molested in 2001 and 2002 while he was counseling minors at Central Juvenile Hall, also known as Eastlake.

Los Angeles Times
News Article
August 14, 2004

APRIL 28, 2005 | LITIGATION

[Print](#) | [Email](#)
[Reprint rights](#)

Judge Bars DA's From Accessing Priest's Files

By Liz Valsamis

Daily Journal Staff Writer

LOS ANGELES - A Superior Court judge on Wednesday blocked Los Angeles prosecutors' latest attempt to get access to files the Roman Catholic Archdiocese kept on a priest accused of sexual abuse.

Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Samuel Mayerson said the district attorney's request for the entire file kept on defrocked priest Michael Wempe between 1990 and 1995 was overly broad. *People v. Wempe*, BA253178 (L.A. Super. Ct., filed Sept. 11, 2003).

Prosecutors want to see if the files back up statements made by seven people who say they can corroborate the alleged abuse.

The church has said two of those witnesses show up in Wempe's file, according to the archdiocese's lawyer Don Woods of Hennigan Bennett & Dorman.

The church has never had a problem with turning over victims' sexual abuse reports, Woods said.

"That's not what we seek to protect," he added.

Steier, of Los Angeles's Guzin & Steier, objected to the release of all church documents pertaining to Wempe, saying it would violate the former priest's privacy.

Deputy District Attorney R. Todd Hicks, who is prosecuting Wempe, could not be reached for comment.

Wempe originally was charged with molesting 13 boys beginning in 1977. Those charges were dropped after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the state could not revive the statute of limitation in sexual abuse cases.

Daily Journal
New Article
April 28, 2005

Staff & Wire Reports
June 1, 2005

Trial of ex-county priest to start next week in L.A.

By staff and wire reports
June 1, 2005

LOS ANGELES -- A retired Roman Catholic priest will stand trial next week for allegedly molesting a boy in the 1990s.

Jury selection is scheduled to begin June 9 in the case against Michael Wempe, who faces three counts of committing a lewd act on a child and one count of oral copulation of a person under 16.

The current case stems from charges filed in September, months after a U.S. Supreme Court ruling voided 42 other sexual abuse allegations against Wempe. The alleged victim, now in his mid-20s, is the brother of two previous alleged victims.

Wempe, who is free on bond, was first charged with molesting five boys across Southern California between the mid-1970s and mid-1980s. The charges were thrown out when the nation's high court struck down a California law that erased the statute of limitations on sexual abuse cases from 1988 and earlier.

Wempe served throughout the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, including time as an associate pastor during the 1970s and '80s at St. Rose of Lima Church in Simi Valley, St. Jude Church in Westlake Village, Sacred Heart Church in Ventura, and St. Sebastian Church in Santa Paula.

Among those who made charges that were thrown out because of the statute of limitations was Lee Bashforth of Newport Beach. He had alleged that Wempe molested him and his brother when they lived in the Conejo Valley in the '70s and '80s.

Bashforth alleged he and his older brother, Mark, were molested when they were children and attending St. Jude Church in Westlake Village, where Wempe was an associate pastor. Bashforth said his abuse, blocked from memory until 2002, included molestations by Wempe at the rectories of Sacred Heart Church in Ventura and St. Mary Church in Palmdale.


Wempe served as an associate pastor in the Ventura County area intermittently from 1969 to 1987, starting at St. Rose of Lima in Simi Valley, moving to St. Jude and then to Sacred Heart in the 1970s. After several years at Paraclete High School in Lancaster, he was at St. Sebastian Church in Santa Paula until about 1987. Cardinal Roger Mahony then sent him to a sexual disorders treatment center in New Mexico.

After treatment in New Mexico, Wempe was reassigned as chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center in Los Angeles. That became controversial several years ago when Mahony acknowledged he should have told hospital officials more about the priest's background.

Wempe was removed from the ministry in 2002 by Mahony.

The Tribune, San Luis Obispo
News Article
January 27, 2006

THE TRIBUNE
SanLuisObispo.com



Search ☐ Recent News ☐ Archives ☐ Web for

- ☐ Jobs
- ☐ Cars
- ☐ Real Estate
- ☐ Apartments
- ☐ Local Shopping
- ☐ All Classifieds
 - Create an Ad
 - Find an Ad
- ☐ Dating

- News**
- Obituaries
 - Breaking News
 - Local
 - Nation
 - Photos
 - Politics
 - State
 - Weird News
 - World
 - Central Coast Sun Bulletin

- Sports**
- Entertainment**
- Business**
- Living**
- Opinion/Letters**

ONLINE FEATURES

- Newspaper Ads Online
- Advertising sections
- Past articles
- Discussion Boards
- Maps & Directions
- Newcomers Guide
- Newsroom Projects
- Yellow Pages

SITE SERVICES

Contact Us

[Back to Home](#) > [News](#) >

Politics

email this print this reprint or license this

Posted on Fri, Jan. 27, 2006

Witness in priest sexual abuse trial weeps while testifying

LINDA DEUTSCH
Associated Press

LOS ANGELES - A sexual abuse victim wept in court as he described his love for a priest who he says betrayed him and his belief that he failed to protect his younger brothers.

"I can accept that I was abused but I can't accept the fact that I was the gatekeeper, that I let it happen to my brothers," the man, identified in court only as Mark B, said Thursday.

The 42-year-old testified in the trial of Michael Wempe, a former priest who is charged with molesting Mark's younger brother, Jayson, in the 1990s. Jayson was scheduled to testify Friday after Mark was cross-examined.

Wempe has admitted to molesting 13 boys in the 1970s and '80s but has not been tried in those cases because of a Supreme Court ruling barring retroactive extension of the statute of limitations on old cases. Mark and another brother, Lee, were affected by the ruling.

Jayson came forward three months after the Supreme Court's ruling. While the defense acknowledges that Mark and Lee were abused, it claims that Jayson's allegations were fabricated to seek retribution for his brothers.

Mark testified that the former priest ingratiated himself to his mother and became a surrogate father to him and his brothers because their own father was always preoccupied with business.

Meanwhile, he said Wempe took him on motorcycle trips where he would fondle him. Mark kept the secrets, he said, because Wempe meant so much to him and his family.

"I loved the guy," he said, burying his face in his hands and weeping.

409506

2/7/2006

<http://www.sanluisobispo.com/news/politics/13721096.htm>

• Staff List

RSS Headlines

Advertise

Wempe, seated across the courtroom, flushed bright red.

Mark said he and his brother Lee first shared memories of alleged abuse in 2002. But he said he never spoke to Jayson about his own abuse and was "floored" when he heard the youngest brother might have been abused.

As court recessed for the day, Wempe began to sob and covered his eyes with a handkerchief.



email this



print this



reprint or license this

Help Hurricane Victims

Donate to the Disaster Relief Fund Providing
Shelter, Food & Support

www.RedCross.org

Public Service Ads by Gox

REAL Cities

Visit other Real Cities sites

News | Business | Sports | Entertainment | Living | Shop Local | Classifieds | Jobs | Car
About SanLuisObispo.com | About the Real Cities Network | Terms of Use & Privacy Statement | About

The Tribune, San Luis Obispo
News Article
January 27, 2006
(continued)

409507

2/7/2006

CCI 006101

The Mercury News

MercuryNews.com

The Mercury News
News Article
February 10, 2006

Posted on Fri, Feb. 10, 2006

Jury in LA priest sex abuse trial seeks reading of testimony

LINDA DEUTSCH
Associated Press

LOS ANGELES - Jurors in a molestation case against a retired Roman Catholic priest ended their first day of deliberations Friday with a request to hear a readback of testimony from the trial's key witness.

According to the court, the panel asked for a reading of a limited portion of the testimony of the 26-year-old man who claims he was molested by Michael Wempe in the 1990s. The alleged victim is known as Jayson B.

The matter will be taken up with lawyers when the jurors return from a long weekend. Monday is a court holiday and the panel does not resume its talks until Tuesday afternoon because of a juror's previously scheduled medical appointment in the morning.

The case was submitted to jurors by Superior Court Judge Curtis Rappe on Friday morning. He spent about a half hour reading to them legal instructions dealing with the charges against Wempe and with the evidence of uncharged crimes presented during the trial.

Eight men were permitted to tell jurors about their own molestations by Wempe during the 1970s and 80s, acts which the priest acknowledges. However, he cannot be tried for those crimes because of a statute of limitations.

The five charges against him in the current case involve only Jayson B. The impact of the past crimes on the jurors' consideration of the case was addressed in a specific legal instruction.

"If you conclude that the defendant committed the uncharged offenses," the instruction said, "that conclusion is only one factor to consider along with all the other evidence. It is not sufficient by itself to prove that the defendant is guilty of the crimes charged. The people must still prove each element of every charge beyond a reasonable doubt."

Exhibit 24
Further Media Coverage

409509

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

Subscriber Services

THE TRIBUNE
SanLuisObispo.com

The Tribune, San Luis Obispo
 News Article
 January 23, 2006

Search ☒ Recent News ☐ Archives ☐ Web for

- ☒ Jobs
- ☒ Cars
- ☒ Real Estate
- ☒ Apartments
- ☒ Local Shopping
- ☒ All Classifieds
 - Create an Ad
 - Find an Ad
- ☒ Dating

News

- Local
- Obituaries
- State

Sports**Entertainment****Business****Central Coast Living**




- Travel

Opinion/Letters**Morro Bay/Los Osos****ONLINE FEATURES****Newspaper Ads Online****Advertising sections****Past articles****Discussion Boards****Maps & Directions****Newcomers Guide****Newsroom Projects****Yellow Pages****SITE SERVICES****Contact Us**

- Staff List

RSS Headlines**Advertise****TRIBUNE FORMS****Download PDFs****Birth****Engagement****50th Anniversary**

[Back to Home >](#)

 [email this](#)  [print this](#)  [reprint or license this](#)

Posted on Mon, Jan. 23, 2006

Trial begins in molestation case against retired LA priest

LINDA DEUTSCH
 Associated Press

LOS ANGELES - A prosecutor described in graphic detail Monday the molestation of numerous boys by retired Roman Catholic priest Michael Wempe but told jurors they would be asked to convict him of crimes against only one alleged victim who is now grown.

Deputy District Attorney Todd Hicks said in his opening statement that most of the men who will testify repressed their memories of the abuse for many years, as did the man whose claims led to the current criminal trial.

Wempe's lawyer, however, told the jury that the claims of the most recent alleged victim were false and were fabricated to avenge the molestation of his two brothers many years earlier.

Attorney Leonard Levine said he would not contest the many molestations that Wempe committed between 1972 and 1987.

"For that there is no excuse, no explanation and no defense, and none will be offered," he said.

"If this case was about that it would be an entirely different matter. But it is not," the defense attorney said.

"Nothing will change the fact that molestations occurred here and throughout this country and one of the perpetrators was my client," he said as Wempe sat staring straight ahead. "The accounts you will hear from these adults, as heart-rending as they may be, will have little to do with the facts in this case."

The molestation alleged to have occurred between 1990 and 1995 did not happen, Levine said.

The trial's first witness was to be called later in the day.

The jury includes several deeply religious people who believe that priests should be held to a high moral standard because of their role as spiritual leaders.

409510

Press Release
Spotlight
Student Spotlight
Wedding

PHOTO STORE



Buy photos
Order high quality photos
from our online gallery.

quality photo prints by

Pictopia.com

Most said during jury selection that they found the issue of clergy child abuse disturbing but promised to be fair in judging Wempe.

"I'm always kind of saddened by these kinds of cases," said a woman juror. "I think priests are our spiritual leaders and they have a greater accountability."

The woman, who said she had been excommunicated by the Catholic Church when she married a divorced man, said she holds no hard feelings against the church.

Some other panelists, however, expressed their concern about the way the entire priest molestation issue was handled by the Los Angeles Archdiocese. That issue is likely to be a subtext of Wempe's trial, which centers on activities that followed his return to priestly duties after six months of therapy. Cardinal Roger Mahony approved his reassignment as chaplain of Cedars Sinai Hospital in spite of his history as a molester.

Wempe, 66, has pleaded not guilty to five counts of lewd conduct and molestation of a boy between 1990 and 1995. His attorney, however, acknowledged in November that Wempe did abuse 13 other boys between 1977 and 1986. Eight of them will be allowed to testify at Wempe's current trial.

Charges involving the 13 others were dismissed after the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a state law in 2003 that allowed retroactive prosecution of decades-old sex crimes involving children.

The six men and six women of the jury promised to keep in mind that he is being tried only for charges involving the one boy in the 1990s, not for the decades-old sex crimes he has admitted.

Loyola University Law School Professor Laurie Levenson said jurors will have a tough task.

"Jurors will still pause before they let a priest go when he has done so much harm to so many," she said. "They would be worried about the message it would send."

The allegations Wempe now faces were made by a young man who came forward three months after the Supreme Court's ruling.

The accuser, now 20, is the brother of two boys whose cases were dismissed. Levine claims the allegations are the fabrications of a young man seeking retribution for his brothers.

The emotional issues involved in the case - sexual abuse, children and religion - led to a complicated and probing jury selection that lasted a full week.

Many prospective jurors were dismissed when they said they could not put aside their feelings of revulsion about child molestation.

After the 2003 Supreme Court ruling, the Los Angeles County district attorney's office was forced to dismiss multiple charges against 11 priests involving numerous alleged victims, most of whom have since filed civil suits seeking damages for suffering and emotional distress.

Another former priest spared charges by the 2003 ruling, Michael Stephen Baker, was arrested Thursday when he returned from Thailand. Police said Baker, 58, is suspected of molesting a boy for 12 years beginning in 1984.

The Tribune, San Luis Obispo
News Article
January 23, 2006
(continued)

409511

His arraignment was scheduled in the same courthouse where Wempe's trial got under way Monday.

[email this](#)[print this](#)[reprint or license this](#)**Ads by Google****Spyware Remover Download**

Free Scan, awarded Spyware and Adware killer - 5 Stars Rated.
www.pctools.com

Which Spyware Remover?

5 Spyware removers reviewed with detailed side-by-side comparisons.
www.DefeatSpyware.org

Free Spyware Detection

Award-Wining Spyware Remover. Block Popups & more. Download Now.
www.STOPzilla.com

REAL Cities
Visit other Real Cities sites

[News](#) | [Business](#) | [Sports](#) | [Entertainment](#) | [Living](#) | [Shop Local](#) | [Classifieds](#) | [Jobs](#) | [Car](#)
[About SanLuisObispo.com](#) | [About the Real Cities Network](#) | [Terms of Use & Privacy Statement](#) | [About](#)

The Tribune, San Luis Obispo
News Article
January 23, 2006
(continued)

Free Checking
Feel the freedom... No fees.

Call
661-258-4407
or
661-945-6626

EDWAL
FEDERAL CREDIT
YOUR CHOICE

dailynews.com

JOBS AUTOS HOMES MARKETPLACE

Article Search
Search Daily

Los Angeles, CA, 2/7/2006

- HOME
- NEWS
- SPORTS
- BUSINESS
- OPINIONS
- ENTERTAINMENT
- HEALTH
- TRAVEL
- INFO

DailyNews.com A-Z

- Link To Article
- Print Article
- Email Article

Article Launched: 01/25/2006 12:00:00 AM

Sexual abuse of teen alleged during trial of former priest
Linda Deutsch, Associated Press

LOS ANGELES (AP) - A succession of grown men testified Tuesday that ex-priest Michael Wempe trapped them in a web of sexual molestation that began in their childhoods and continues to shadow their lives today.

Pointing across the courtroom where the former Roman Catholic clergyman was seated at the counsel table, on trial for molestation, prosecutor Todd Hicks asked a witness identified only as Jay.F. how he knew Wempe.

"From a nightmare," said the 39-year-old man.

At one point, staring at Wempe, he said bitinglly: "This guy is so sick."

He graphically outlined a pattern of molestation that involved fondling, masturbation and oral copulation that began when he was 13 and also ensnared two of his brothers.

He said he felt "trapped and confused" during the two years that Wempe abused him.

"As a Catholic, you're taught the priest is the closest thing to God, someone you should respect," he said. "Then you're caught in this abuse and you don't know what to do.... You think it will go away."

Jay F. said he never mentioned his ordeal to anyone until 10 years ago when he blurted it out in a confessional. But the priest who heard his confession did nothing, he said.

He said he decided to come forward when he heard about the nationwide priest scandal and wishes now he had spoken up sooner because, "I could have saved other kids."

Another victim, identified as John C. testified he has had trouble remembering everything that happened to him because he was so young. He said he was molested between the ages of 5 and 7.

"I started remembering things....," he said. "It's like trying to complete a puzzle and suddenly you have a box of pieces you didn't know you had. I'm trying to get my life in order and my interest is in finding out what these pieces were."

Advertisement

L.A. Daily News
News Article
January 25, 2006

The 27-year-old man, who works in San Francisco, also said: "These things are dictating most of my behavior to this point."

After his involvement with the priest, John C. said, he became an incorrigible student who was suspended and eventually expelled from high school. He said he kept a

- Other
- to sc
 - tensi
 - like c
 - hom
 - heac
 - for d
 - the r
 - Gold
 - beef
 - retire
 - Pear
 - than
 - witne



picture of the Unabomber in his high school locker and made bomb threats.

Eventually, he said, he was arrested and wound up living in a group home.

John C. said he is one of many of Wempe's victims who have filed suit against the Archdiocese of Los Angeles but is less interested in the money than punishment for those involved.

"If I could wail on the church wall for a couple of days, that would be better," he said.

Of his testimony, he said, "I don't believe in confession in church. Hopefully this will help me get on."

Wempe's attorney, Leonard Levine, who gently cross-examined the witnesses and voiced no objections to any of the prosecutor's questions, has admitted that his client molested 13 boys in the 1970s and '80s. But he maintains that Wempe is not guilty of molesting another boy in the 1990s, the case for which he is on trial. That young man was to testify later in the week.

L.A. Daily News
News Article
January 25, 2006
(continued)



Sponsored Links

Los Angeles DUI Lawyer
Home Refinance Loans
Product Tests
Mortgage

Lapel Pins
Las Vegas hotels
Vacations
Popcorn Machines Direct

Business Card Design
Monitor
Auto insurance
Find aupairs & nanny search

Paintball Guns
Valentine's Day G
Personalized Gifts
Luxury
Fruit Gift Baskets

Copyright Notice
Privacy Policy

Copyright © 2006
Los Angeles Newspaper Group

409514


Los Angeles Times
News Article
January 25, 2006

latimes.com **THE STATE** HOME | HELP

NEWS ENTERTAINMENT OTHER SECTIONS CLASSIFIEDS JOBS CARS HOMES RENTALS SHO

ADVERTISEMENT

moreinstore



See the **extra** in-store deals found in the printed Weekly

[Go to More](#)

January 25, 2006

latimes.com : California : The State

[Print](#)

Wempe Weeps as Witness Testifies


■ A man describes actions by the then-priest when he was a student in Lancaster. Others testify about molestations.

By Jean Guccione, Times Staff Writer

Michael Stephen Wempe wept Tuesday as a Houston man testified that the former priest used religion class to teach him about masturbation, then encouraged him to practice when they were alone.

The testimony came during the second day of Wempe's trial on charges of abusing a boy in the early 1990s. Wempe, through his attorney, has admitted to molesting 13 boys decades ago, but denies the more recent abuse allegations.

ADVERTISEMENT




INTRODUCING THE
HP iPAQ hw6515—
at work, play and on the go.

ONLY \$399.99*
» GO EXPLORING

*after \$50 mail-in rebate with qualifying service plans

Good X-tingular



Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Curtis R. Rappe is allowing testimony about past molestations to bolster prosecutors' contention that Wempe was a practiced abuser who used the same script to exploit children for decades.

The Houston man attended Paraclete High School in Lancaster, where Wempe taught religion and coached golf. When Deputy Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks asked the man if he was a good golfer, Wempe, sitting at the defense table, nodded yes.

The two men had not seen each other for decades, and the witness did not look at Wempe as he left the courtroom.

Wempe, 66, faces up to 16 years in prison if convicted of charges of lewd conduct with a minor and oral copulation.

His attorney, Leonard Levine, said the current accuser is lying to avenge his two brothers, whose cases were barred by a U.S. Supreme Court ruling. Wempe has not molested anyone since Cardinal Roger M. Mahony sent him to

residential therapy in the 1980s, and he is sincerely sorry for his past misconduct, Levine said.

"Here is somebody who has changed and is obviously remorseful about what happened," he said.

Mahony has called his decision to assign Wempe to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, where the most recent abuse was alleged, a mistake. He said he didn't know that the hospital had a children's ward.

The Times generally does not identify sexual abuse victims.

Earlier in the day, another man testified that he was visiting Wempe's rectory at St. Sebastian Catholic Church in Santa Paula when he was startled to see his teenage brother lying naked on the priest's bed. Wempe, bare-

409515

ched, appeared in the doorway and told him to come in, the man, now 26, testified.

"Father Mike said, 'Come back here. It's your turn,'" the man recalled.

A third witness, a 39-year-old Valencia man, said he would often sleep in the priest's bed at St. Mary's Catholic Church in Palmdale. The next day, he would assist Wempe at Mass as an altar boy.

"He would fondle me, then give the body of Christ to the whole church with that same hand," the man testified.

Late one night, when he was 15, the priest was driving him home when he detoured to a rest stop on a secluded mountain road, where he orally copulated him, the man testified. The next morning, he said, the priest met his school bus at Quartz Hill High School and warned him not to tell his friends.

Shortly afterward, the man quit ninth grade and hitchhiked to San Diego.

He confessed the molestation to a Valencia priest in the 1990s, he testified.

"I was hoping that the priest would reach out to me," he said. But the priest did nothing, he said.

MORE NEWS

L.A. Tortilla Chip Pioneer Dies
Angels' Molina Signs With Blue Jays
Baghdad, Fallouja Attacks Kill 8 Iraqis
Body of Airman Found in Sierra Identified

latimes.com
Site Map

California | Local
World
Nation
Business
Sports
Travel
Editorials, Op-Ed

calendario.com
Arts & Entertainment

Columns
Education
Food
Health
Highway 1
Home
Outdoors

If you want other stories on this topic, search the Archives at latimes.com/archives.

TMSReprints

Article licensing and reprint options

Copyright 2006 Los Angeles Times | Privacy Policy | Terms of Service
Home Delivery | Advertise | Archives | Contact Us | Site Map | Help

PARTNERS:



Los Angeles Times
News Article
January 25, 2006
(continued)

409516

Witness in priest sexual abuse trial weeps while testifying

Associated Press
News Article
January 26, 2006

By Linda Deutsch
ASSOCIATED PRESS
8:21 p.m. January 26, 2006

LOS ANGELES — A sexual abuse victim wept in court Thursday as he described his love for a priest who he says betrayed him and his belief that he failed to protect his younger brothers.

"I can accept that I was abused but I can't accept the fact that I was the gatekeeper, that I let it happen to my brothers," said the man identified in court only as Mark B.

The 42-year-old testified in the trial of Michael Wempe, who is charged with molesting Mark's younger brother, Jayson, in the 1990s.

The former priest has admitted he molested 13 boys in the 1970s and '80s but has not been tried in those cases because of a Supreme Court ruling barring retroactive extension of the statute of limitations on old cases. Mark and another brother, Lee, were affected by the ruling.

Jayson came forward three months after the Supreme Court's ruling. While the defense acknowledges that Mark and Lee were abused, it claims that Jayson's allegations were fabricated to seek retribution for his brothers.

Mark testified that the former priest ingratiated himself to his mother and became a surrogate father to him and his brothers because their own father was always preoccupied with business.

Meanwhile, he said Wempe took him on motorcycle trips where he would fondle him. Mark kept the secrets, he said, because Wempe meant so much to him and his family.


"I loved the guy," he said, burying his face in his hands and weeping.

Wempe, seated across the courtroom, flushed bright red.

Mark said he and his brother Lee first shared memories of alleged abuse in 2002. But he said he never spoke to Jayson about his own abuse and was "floored" when he heard the youngest brother might have been abused.

As court recessed for the day, Wempe began to sob and covered his eyes with a handkerchief. Jayson was scheduled to testify Friday.

Advertisement



SUBSCRIBE TODAY

CONTRA COSTA TIMES

Subscriber Services

ContraCostaTimes
.comContra Costa Times
News Article
January 27, 2006**HEATING, AIR CONDITION**Search ☐ Recent News ☐ Archives ☐ Web for

- ☐ Jobs
- ☐ Cars
- ☐ Real Estate
- ☐ Apartments
- ☐ Local Shopping
- ☐ All Classifieds
 - Create an Ad
 - Find an Ad
- ☐ Dating

News

- Breaking News
- Obituaries
- Corrections
- Local News
- Contra Costa Co.
- Alameda County
- Where we live
- Bay & State
- Gov. Arnold
- Nation & World
- Iraq
- War on terror
- Crime & Courts
- Education
- Health
- Politics
- Science
- Transportation
- Commuter page

Communities

- Eastern Contra Costa
- Central Contra Costa
- Western Contra Costa
- Eastern Alameda
- Oakland-Berkeley

Sports**Entertainment****Life & Culture****Business****Opinion****Columnists**[Back to Home](#) > [Business](#) > [60-second Business Break](#) >**Crime & Courts**

email this print this

Posted on Fri, Jan. 27, 2006

Abuse victim laments his brother's fateBy Linda Deutsch
ASSOCIATED PRESS

LOS ANGELES - A sexual abuse victim wept in court Thursday as he told of his love for Michael Wempe, the priest he said betrayed him, and his belief that he failed to protect his younger brothers from similar abuse.

"I can accept that I was abused but I can't accept the fact that I was the gatekeeper, that I let it happen to my brothers," said the man identified as Mark B.

"Every day I look at my brothers and realize it was my responsibility," he said. "I could have called the police. I just didn't have the courage to say anything."

The 42-year-old man, who now lives in Norway, came to the witness stand as a prosecutor prepared to call to the stand his youngest brother, Jayson, the sole victim who claims he was abused during a period for which Wempe can be charged criminally.

The former priest has admitted he molested 13 boys in the 1970s and '80s but has not been tried in those cases because of a U.S. Supreme Court ruling barring retroactive extension of the statute of limitations on old cases.

Defense attorneys maintain the older brothers helped Jayson fabricate a story of later abuse in order to punish Wempe for his earlier behavior.

But Mark testified he never spoke to Jayson about his own abuse and was "floored" when he heard the youngest brother might have been abused.

He described Jayson as "a happy kid until he was 6 or 7 and he became very withdrawn."

Jayson, who is now 26, claims he was molested by Wempe in the 1990s after the former priest returned from therapy and was assigned by Cardinal Roger Mahony to be the Catholic chaplain at Cedars Sinai Medical Center.

409518

[Weather](#)[Discussion Boards](#)[Other Editions](#)[Special Sections](#)**ONLINE EXTRAS**[Past Articles](#)[Newspaper Ads](#)[Special Reports](#)[Multimedia](#)[Maps & Directions](#)[Newsletters](#)[Traffic Reports](#)[Yellow Pages](#)[Buy photos](#)[Career Fairs](#)**SITE SERVICES**[RSS Headlines](#)[Contact Us](#)[Site Map](#)[Advertise](#)[Subscriber Services](#)[Jobs at the Times](#)**PARTNER SITES**[SiliconValley.com](#)

His older brother Mark was the seventh and most emotional of the victims to testify so far.

Mark said he had completely repressed all memories of his abuse until June 2001, when he was on the way to his brother's wedding.

He said his brother Lee had invited Wempe to participate.

"I was getting ready for the wedding and something clicked. I was getting visual pieces of a puzzle in my head, like snapshots of abuse," he recalled. "It all came rushing out like a waterfall."

He had kept the secrets well, he said, because Wempe meant so much to him and his family.

"I loved the guy," he said, burying his face in his hands and weeping.

Wempe, seated across the courtroom, flushed bright red.

As court recessed for the day, Wempe began to sob and covered his eyes with a handkerchief. Jayson was scheduled to testify Friday. Wempe denies that he abused Jayson.

Mark also told a story now familiar to jurors from other witnesses of how Wempe charmed parishioners at St. Jude's Catholic Church in Westlake Village. He added that the former priest also ingratiated himself to his mother and became a surrogate father to himself and his brothers because their own father was always preoccupied with business. He said his mother encouraged the contacts.

"She adored him. She felt he was our connection to God. He was our spiritual ticket," Mark said of the 66-year-old, gray-haired defendant. "He cemented our relationship to the church."

He said his mother was so devoted to Wempe that she would cook for him and volunteered to redecorate his room at the rectory.

Meanwhile, he said Wempe was taking him on motorcycle trips where he would fondle him.

"Every time I came back from a ride with him, I closed down in my mind what had happened," he said. "I buried it deep, deep in my mind and put it away."

He said he and his brother Lee first shared memories of alleged abuse in 2002.

"We spent the next half hour on the phone crying, trying to console each other," he said. "It was gut wrenching, my worst nightmare."

[email this](#)[print this](#)

Contra Costa Times
News Article
January 27, 2006
(continued)

Los Angeles Times
News Article
February 1, 2006

MEMBER SERVICE
Join now!

latimes.com **RELIGION**

NEWS ENTERTAINMENT OTHER SECTIONS CLASSIFIEDS JOBS CARS HOMES RENTALS SHO



February 1, 2006

latimes.com : Religion

Print

Witness Against Priest Turns Defiant


■ Jayson B. refuses to change his testimony after the suspect's lawyer questions the accuracy of his memory about alleged molestations.

By Jean Guccione, Times Staff Writer

The tears of the key witness in the trial of admitted child molester Father Michael Wempe turned to open defiance Tuesday as the retired priest's lawyer cross-examined him about details of his alleged abuse.

The witness, who was identified in court only as Jayson B., had cried through three days of testimony about his alleged fondling and oral copulation by the priest, whom Cardinal Roger M. Mahony had assigned to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center after sending him for treatment for pedophilia.

ADVERTISEMENT

 **moreinstore**

See the extra
in-store deals
not found
in the printed
Weekly Ad.

Go to
More In Store



But when attorney Leonard Levine questioned his memory of being abused in a purple-blue Thunderbird three times from 1991 to 1995, Jayson B. refused to change his story. Levine said the car wasn't bought until 1995.

"You are asking me about a car I was in five times 15 years ago," Jayson B., now 26, said. "I'm not going to change what I remember."

The witness repeatedly told Levine these were details he has spent a lifetime trying to forget.

Wempe originally was charged with abusing five boys, including Jayson B.'s brothers, but was released from jail when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that California could not retroactively prosecute decades-old abuse cases.

Jayson B. then came forward and accused the former priest of molesting him in the 1990s.

Wempe later conceded that he had molested 13 boys, including Jayson B.'s older brothers. Wempe's lawyers say Jayson B. is lying to avenge his family.

Earlier, Jayson B. testified that he never told anyone that Wempe had molested him, even after his two older brothers went to authorities in 2002 to report that the priest had molested them.

"I knew that he was going to be punished and I would never have to reveal my secret," he testified, adding that he "would have taken this to the grave."

But his attitude changed a year later, when Jayson B. learned that the criminal case against Wempe had been dismissed and the now-retired priest was a free man.

409520

Deputy Los Angeles County Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks asked Jayson B. how he felt when he saw a photograph of a grinning Wempe walking out of jail. "I felt like I had been punched in the stomach," he responded.

Jayson B. said he learned that his alleged molestations could still be prosecuted under the U.S. Supreme Court ruling. "I knew that if I told what had happened to me that he would be punished," he testified.

The man said he spent the summer after graduating from UCLA trying to build up the courage to tell his family and police that Wempe had molested him too.

On cross-examination, Levine asked if he had come forward with the current accusations to protect his brothers and mother, who were upset when Wempe was released from jail.

"No," he answered. "That makes no sense whatsoever."

Jayson B.'s testimony is to continue today in the downtown Los Angeles courtroom of Judge Curtis Rappe.

MORE NEWS

L.A. Tortilla Chip Pioneer Dies
Angels' Molina Signs With Blue Jays
Baghdad, Fallouja Attacks Kill 8 Iraqis
Body of Airman Found in Sierra Identified

latimes.com
Site Map

California | Local
World
Nation
Business
Sports
Travel
Editorials, Op-Ed

calendarlive.com
Arts & Entertainment

Columns
Education
Food
Health
Highway 1
Home
Outdoors

If you want other stories on this topic, search the Archives at latimes.com/archives.

TMSReprints

Article licensing and reprint options

Copyright 2006 Los Angeles Times | Privacy Policy | Terms of Service
Home Delivery | Advertise | Archives | Contact Us | Site Map | Help

PARTNERS:



Los Angeles Times
News Article
February 1, 2006
(continued)

Los Angeles Times
News Article
February 8, 2006

1BER SEI
10W!

latimes.com **CALIFORNIA**

NEWS ENTERTAINMENT OTHER SECTIONS CLASSIFIEDS JOBS CARS HOMES RENTALS SHO



February 8, 2006

latimes.com : California

E-mail:

Chronicling Priest's Pattern of Abuse

■ In court, victims tell of a hip, outdoorsy Michael Wempe lavishing them with attention and trips.


By Jessica Garrison and Jean Guccione, Times Staff Writers

Retired priest Michael Edwin Wempe is older now, with curled, arthritic-looking hands and watery, crystalline eyes. As he has sat in a downtown Los Angeles courtroom these last three weeks, red-faced and silently weeping, it has been difficult to see him as his victims did: as the hip, long-haired cleric on a motorcycle who, by his own admission, seduced and molested 13 boys during his 36-year career in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

But as the witnesses recounted, Wempe, now 66, had an eye for needy boys from troubled families: He invited them for dinner in the rectory, and then took them into his bed while the other priests slept. He put them on the front of his motorcycle and in his car, and then fondled them as they drove — in one case crashing in a bloody accident. After violating them at night, he rewarded them with extra-large pieces of Communion wafers at Mass the next morning.

ADVERTISEMENT

PETROPOLIS



ADVERTISING SUPPLEMENT

Four years after the clergy abuse scandal exploded across the country and in the Los Angeles Archdiocese, Wempe's trial, which is expected to go to the jury this week, offers a rare picture of a serial abuser. After years of simmering scandal and secret negotiations, eight men have come into open court to confront the priest who molested them.

Their testimony highlights how, in parish after parish, the priest surrounded himself with boys — and for years no church officials seemed to express concern or intervene. The allegations that the church did not act could prove pivotal not just to Wempe's fate, but also to the Los Angeles Archdiocese, which is facing more than 560 lawsuits charging that it failed to protect children from abusive priests.

"You would have fun, but you paid the price," testified one of Wempe's victims, who estimated that the priest molested him in the rectory 30 to 40 times, and on a motorcycle, in cars and during camping trips. "He would attack you."

As victims described monstrous acts of abuse that ruined their lives and sent them spiraling into substance abuse, Wempe's lawyer made no objection. Still, the retired priest, among the most prolific abusers in the archdiocese's molestation scandal, denies the crime for which he is on trial — allegedly molesting the younger brother of two of his victims.

The cleric's lawyer says the accuser is making up the charges to avenge the brothers, whose abuses happened too long ago to allow prosecution of Wempe for them. The lawyer has tried to show that the accuser is wrong on key details, such as the color of the priest's car.

409522

2/8/2006

CCI 006116

Wempe's defense is that he used to be a pedophile but that he was cured after Cardinal Roger M. Mahony sent him to therapy in 1987. The therapy came more than 20 years after Wempe was ordained and more than 15 years after his first admitted victims entered his life.

Court documents and testimony outline a pattern of abuse repeated many times.

Wempe was about 30 and had been an assistant pastor at St. Rose of Lima Catholic Church in Simi Valley for two years when he met Vincent and Timothy F. As he would do again, he befriended a Catholic family with young boys. He accepted invitations to dinner and proved himself to be a delightful and charming guest.

Before long, he was treated like an honored member of the family, saying Mass in the home, offering a sympathetic ear to the boys' mother and, to her immense gratitude, taking an interest in her preteen sons, according to the prosecutors. (Vincent and Timothy F. did not testify.)

For the boys, the attention was exhilarating: Wempe was not only patient and caring, he was also one cool dude. He had a full beard, long hair and a motorcycle. And as if that weren't enough, he was devoted to camping, fishing and shooting.

In court over the last three weeks, several witnesses described how Wempe would initiate the abuse.

After gaining the parents' trust, he would invite his altar boys for motorcycle rides. With their own driver's licenses often years away, they were delighted — even more so when Wempe said they could steer.

But inevitably, the thrill of the ride was interrupted when Wempe's hands strayed into their laps, then inside their pants.

"He would say, 'My hands are cold,'" testified Richard Kirby, who was molested by Wempe from 1976 to 1978 and became a Washington lobbyist. "It was a little weird, but I was getting to drive a motorcycle."

During camping trips and sleepovers at the rectory, meanwhile, the boys often woke in the night to feel Wempe's hands between their legs, the men testified. Other times, the priest would talk to them about the beauty of masturbation and explain that it was God's way of releasing tension.

Sitting at the defendant's table, Wempe's ruddy face sometimes turned red, then purple. Occasionally, tears dripped down his cheeks.

He seems to have been quite open about letting the boys sleep in the rectory; several people testified that they came and went with regularity and ate dinner there with the other priests. Still, the men testified, sometimes Wempe would tell them to keep their activities secret.

A few altar boys also testified that he had a particular way of showing his gratitude: During Mass, he would break off extra-large pieces of wafers for them.

In 1973, Wempe was transferred from St. Rose of Lima to St. Jude in nearby Westlake Village.

He continued his relationships with Vincent and Timothy F., and he began abusing at least five other boys.

Among them were Robert B., whose father was an alcoholic and whose mother welcomed Wempe into her home, and Mark and Lee B., brothers of Wempe's current accuser. Robert B. did not testify; Mark and Lee B. did.

In 1976, while he was posted in Westlake Village, Vincent and Timothy F.'s mother went to St. Jude to complain, according to court documents. Church officials say they have no record of that, according to J. Michael Hennigan, Mahony's lawyer.

The next year, Wempe was transferred to Sacred Heart Church in Ventura. He stayed there eight months before being moved again, to Paraclete High School in Lancaster, where he was golf coach.

Once again, Wempe stayed in contact with boys from his old parish, while also finding new victims closer to home.

There were William M. and Greg J., both members of the golf team. And there were two brothers from Lake Hughes, members of St. Elizabeth's Mission, where Wempe sometimes filled in.

Los Angeles Times
News Article
February 8, 2006
(continued)

409523

As he had done elsewhere, the priest seduced with a mixture of delicious food and adrenaline-pumping outings, such as motorcycle trips to Hearst Castle and water- and snow-skiing trips. He also took some of his victims to visit his own mother.

In 1984, Wempe was moved again, this time to St. Sebastian in Santa Paula.

It did not take long for him to find two fatherless boys. One of them, Patrick C., recalled outings for miniature golf, deep-sea fishing, camping and shooting.

For nearly a decade, Wempe also kept up with Lee B, one of the brothers of his current accuser. In 1986, after years of allowing underage drivers to pilot his cars and motorcycles while he fondled them, Wempe was involved in a car accident.

Lee B. testified that he was driving Wempe's car while the priest sat beside him and his younger brother Jayson B., the present accuser, sat in the back. Lee said the priest began fondling him, causing him to become distracted and swerve into a truck. His brother suffered serious injuries. For a long time, Lee B. said, he blamed himself. Now, he said, he blames Wempe.

Lee B. said the Catholic Church paid for his brother's medical care.

A few months later, someone finally objected to the rectory sleepovers that Wempe held.

Patrick C. and his brother John C. testified that they remembered a priest named Father Rothe angrily approaching them one day as they left Wempe's room.

Rothe had "a very admonishing look on his face," Patrick C. testified, and he gruffly dispatched the boys to wait by the door of the rectory while he talked to Wempe. After that, there was a new rule: Children were not allowed in the rectory.

According to church files, Rothe wrote to the archdiocese's vicar of the clergy accusing Wempe of "boundary violations," which the church defined as "indiscreet conduct with young boys without any evidence of actual molestation."

Shortly after those incidents, Patrick C. testified, Wempe told him that he was being sent on sabbatical. The priest was distressed. He broke down once while saying Mass. He also cried privately to Patrick C., complaining that this would hurt his career. He said he had hoped to become a monsignor.

In 1988, after six months at a treatment center in New Mexico, Wempe returned to Los Angeles County and was assigned to be a chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center — a decision Mahony now says was a mistake.

Wempe remained there until 2002, when Mahony asked him to retire. That same year, as the clergy sex scandal erupted across the country, Wempe's victims began to come forward.

The older brothers of the current accuser were among the first to tell their stories. In 2003, Wempe was charged with molesting children from 1977 to 1986. But the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a California law allowing old prosecutions was invalid. Wempe went free, with his attorney proclaiming the retired priest's innocence.

Late last year, however, Wempe admitted, through his lawyer, that he had molested the 13 boys during the 1970s and '80s. The admission came as part of an attempt to limit damaging testimony in the current trial about old abuse cases.

Shortly after the Supreme Court ruling that set Wempe free, Jayson B. said he had been molested in the 1990s, recently enough to allow prosecution.

Wempe, who has not testified, sits quietly in court next to his lawyer each day. His sister and her husband sit directly behind him; his sister takes notes on a purple notepad.

They are among the few courtroom observers. Wempe's victims, for the most part, did not bring anyone with them for support as they testified about things they said were so painful they'd never even told their wives. Instead, waiting to testify, they sat together in the cool, dim hallway outside the courtroom, talking about Kobe Bryant or paging through paperbacks.

Los Angeles Times
News Article
February 8, 2006
(continued)

409524

During breaks, Wempe at times walked by their little cluster on his way to the bathroom. The victims averted their eyes.

MORE NEWS

Wildfires Battled In Malibu, O.C. VIDEO

A Eulogy for King, a Scolding for Bush

Photo Puts Focus on Britney's Baby VIDEO

Gretzky's Wife Implicated in Gambling Ring

latimes.com

Site Map

California | Local

World

Nation

Business

Sports

Travel

Editorials, Op-Ed

calendarlive.com

Arts & Entertainment

Columns

Education

Food

Health

Highway 1

Home

Outdoors

If you want other stories on this topic, search the Archives at latimes.com/archives.

TMSReprints

Article licensing and reprint options

Copyright 2006 Los Angeles Times | Privacy Policy | Terms of Service
Home Delivery | Advertise | Archives | Contact Us | Site Map | Help

PARTNERS:



Los Angeles Times

News Article

February 8, 2006

(continued)



February 9, 2006 - A prosecutor urged jurors Thursday to convict a priest of sexual molestation charges, depicting him as an unrepentant sinner whose crimes wrecked the lives of those he abused.

With retired Catholic priest Michael Wempe watching impassively from across the courtroom, Deputy District Attorney Todd Hicks spoke of crimes against many men, who have accused the defendant of molesting them.

"In this case you can see what he has done to wreck lives," Hicks said. "You have seen the alcoholism, drug abuse, failed relationships, confusion. You have seen questions and you have seen secrets."



Associated Press
News Article
February 9, 2006

He said that many of the men who were molested as boys didn't come forward until news of a church scandal in Boston triggered their memories.

In his closing arguments, Hicks told jurors, "It's time for the defendant to pay for his sins."

After three weeks of accusations from a parade of eight past molestation victims, jurors are being asked to decide whether one additional man, Jayson B., is telling the truth when he says he was abused by Wempe.

The eight who testified and five others whom Wempe's lawyers admit were abused decades ago are not the issue in this first trial of a priest whose past misconduct could not be prosecuted because of legal time limits.

Jayson alone, now 26, has brought Wempe to court and his is the only case that could send the former priest to jail. Wempe's defense lawyer spent the last day of testimony Wednesday casting doubt on Jayson's veracity, suggesting he made up his story of abuse to avenge his two brothers who were abused by Wempe years earlier.

Throughout the trial, the prosecution portrayed the 66-year-old Wempe as a pedophile who habitually preyed on young boys and the defense claiming he was cured during a church ordered treatment in 1987 and never molested again.

The case is expected to go to the jury Friday.

409526

Jayson B. claims he was sexually abused by Wempe between 1990 and 1995 at Wempe's office at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center and in two cars.

As a young boy, he said, he would sit on Wempe's lap in front of the computer while the priest typed with one hand and fondled him with the other. He testified that he played games on Wempe's office computer and remembered the priest using a Windows program.

On Wednesday, a technology expert who worked at the hospital testified that Wempe's computer had not been equipped for video games nor could it run a Windows program.

Jurors also heard from Ed Torres, a district attorney's senior investigator whose written report on an interview with Jayson last March conflicted with much of what the accuser said on the witness stand.

Torres admitted to errors in his report. He wrote that Jayson claimed to have been molested in the 1970s and '80s. He said he knows now that ^{REDACTED} wasn't born until 1979.

"I must have made a mistake," the witness said.

Wempe, 66, denies molesting Jayson but has acknowledged Jayson's two older brothers were among 13 boys he abused in the 1970s and 1980s. The former priest cannot be prosecuted for those crimes because the statute of limitations has expired.

Copyright 2006 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

[Print story](#)


Associated Press
News Article
February 9, 2006
(continued)

[Email Friend](#)

[E-Mail story](#) [Newsletters](#) [RSS](#)


More Stories

Today's Headlines

- [Chaffee Zoo Board Selects New Zoo Director](#) | 
- [Audits Show Millions in Katrina Aid Wasted](#)
- [Increased Interest in Fresno Sex Club?](#)
- [Man Found Shot & Killed in Sanger](#)

[more of Today's Headlines](#)

Local News

- [Chaffee Zoo Board Selects New Zoo Director](#) | 
- [Man Found Shot & Killed in Sanger](#)

409527

Los Angeles Times
News Article
February 10, 2006

latimes.com **CALIFORNIA** HOME | HELP

NEWS ENTERTAINMENT OTHER SECTIONS CLASSIFIEDS JOBS CARS HOMES RENTALS SHO

ADVERTISEMENT

moreinstore

See the **extra** in-store deals found in the printed Weekly

Go to **More**

February 10, 2006

latimes.com : Print Edition : California

Print

Lawyers Wrap Up Arguments in Priest Abuse Case

■ The defense says Michael Wempe's accuser fabricated his story to avenge his brothers.

By Jessica Garrison and Jean Guccione, Times Staff Writers

After three weeks of testimony, jurors must decide whether retired priest Michael Edwin Wempe continued to molest even after the church sent him for treatment or if he is the victim of a family plot to avenge monstrous crimes committed long ago.

"It is time for the defendant to pay for his sins," Los Angeles County Deputy Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks told jurors in his closing arguments. "It's time. He is guilty."

ADVERTISEMENT

moreinstore

See the **extra** in-store deals not found in the printed Weekly Ad.

Go to
More In Store



The defense concedes that Wempe was "an animal predator," but says he is innocent of abusing a boy in the 1990s at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, where Wempe was a chaplain.

Defense attorney Leonard Levine contends that Wempe's accuser, Jayson B., conspired with his family to make up the allegations after learning that the priest could not be prosecuted for the decades-old abuse of his two older brothers.

"What Michael Wempe did in the '70s and '80s were horrible acts, and we all have a right to hate him for that," Levine said, as Wempe sat at the defendant's table. But Levine added that it is simply unbelievable that the priest molested the younger brother of Lee and Mark B. after he returned from treatment.

"Just consider the facts and the law, and if you do that, I'm sure you'll come to the right verdict, and that verdict can only be not guilty."

Wempe's trial has far-reaching implications, not just for the disgraced former cleric who faces up to 16 years in prison if convicted, but also for the Los Angeles Archdiocese. The jury, including three Catholics, begins deliberating today in the downtown Los Angeles courtroom of Superior Court Judge Curtis Rappe.

Wempe is among at least three Roman Catholic priests accused of continuing to molest children after Cardinal Roger M. Mahony sent them for treatment for pedophilia and then returned them to active ministry.

The Wempe case could make it more difficult for the archdiocese to defend itself against more than 560 civil claims alleging it failed to protect children from predator priests.

In Wempe's criminal trial, however, there has been no question that he has abused children. After years of denial,

409528

CCI 006122

Wempe admitted through his lawyer last year to molesting 13 boys in the 1970s and '80s. He cannot be prosecuted for those acts because the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2003 that they happened too long ago.

Weeks after that ruling, the younger brother of two of Wempe's victims came forward to say that he, too, had been molested — and recently enough for prosecution to go forward.

The prosecution argued that in molesting the boy known as Jayson B. five times from 1991 to 1995, Wempe was basically following a "recipe" of abuse that he had followed throughout his years as a parish priest.

"The defendant used the same playbook with Jayson," Hicks said during his closing argument.

But Wempe did not take Jayson camping, fishing, shooting, golfing and skiing or invite him to sleep in the rectory as he did with his earlier victims. "He can't have a conga line of kids going into ... the rectory," Hicks said.

In fact, Wempe's transfer from a church parish to a hospital forced the priest to change his methods, the prosecutor argued. "There are no altar boys at the hospital," Hicks said, calling it reckless for the priest, after getting help for his problems, to seek out families with boys that he had befriended in earlier assignments.

He compared such actions to a recovering alcoholic returning to his neighborhood bar to get drunk.

Still, Hicks argued, Jayson knew things about Wempe, his office, his cars and his style of touching that he only could have known "because he lived it."

The prosecutor said that if Jayson did conspire with his family to wrongfully accuse Wempe, as the defense contends, they didn't do a very good job of it. The abuse alleged by the men, for example, differs. Jayson testified that Wempe orally copulated him twice in the priest's car. Both of his brothers say they were only fondled.

"The defendant's crimes are terrible," Hicks said, as Wempe sat, expressionless. "His sins are terrible. He has wrecked people's lives."

Wempe's lawyer conceded that the jury had every right to hate his client. But that does not mean he is guilty, he said.

It made no sense for Wempe, knowing he was under suspicion because of past allegations, to take Jayson to his office, Levine argued. And, he added, it made no sense to drive Jayson an hour and a half from Thousand Oaks to Beverly Hills "to molest him for five minutes."

Several other aspects of Jayson's story were similarly unbelievable, Levine argued. One of them is that just one person, Jayson, had accused Wempe of molestation after Mahony sent him to residential therapy.

"My God, not even a false claim was made after 1987," Levine said, noting the financial incentive to file negligence claims against the Catholic Church.

And all of Wempe's contacts with Jayson B. were initiated by his mother, not the priest, who if still a dangerous predator might be more aggressive, Levine said.

The defense lawyer pointed out other potential problems with Jayson's testimony.

Levine said that Jayson recalled being molested in a blue-purple Ford Thunderbird that Wempe did not own until after the alleged abuse had ended. He suggested that it was next to impossible for Wempe to have molested him in the adjacent parking structure of Cedars-Sinai, as Jayson claimed, because there were so many people around.

He also sought to show that Jayson's testimony changed between the preliminary hearing and the trial, a sign, Levine said, that he was making things up. He recalled greater details of his alleged abuse, including that the priest fondled him with his left hand while they worked on a computer in Wempe's hospital office.

MORE NEWS

N.Y. Digs Out From Record Snow

Detainees Abused, U.N. Probe Says

Another Inmate Dies in Jail Fighting

PHOTOS

VIDEO

latimes.com
Site Map

California | Local
World

Los Angeles Times

News Article

February 10, 2006

(continued)

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

San Jose Mercury News

Subscriber Services

The Mercury News

MercuryNews.com



EXTENDEDSTAYHOTELS

EXTENDEDSTAYHOTELS.COM

Get Our Guaranteed
STUDIO SUITES FROM

Search ☐ Recent News ☐ Archives ☐ Web for

- ☐ Jobs
- ☐ Cars
- ☐ Real Estate
- ☐ Apartments
- ☐ Local Shopping
- ☐ All Classifieds
 - Create an Ad
 - Find an Ad
 - Pets
- ☐ Dating

Back to Home > News >

California & the West

email this print this reprint or license this

Posted on Tue, Feb. 21, 2006

Judge in LA priest's trial tells jury to resume deliberations

LINDA DEUTSCH
Associated Press

LOS ANGELES - A judge urged deadlocked jurors Tuesday to try to find "common ground" that might help them resolve child molestation charges against a retired Roman Catholic priest.

The six men and six women, who have been deliberating for a week, sent word Friday they had reached a verdict on one of five counts against Michael Wempe but were unable to agree on anything else. The lone verdict was sealed.

After a long weekend, they returned Tuesday and gave the judge three pages of questions which, if answered, might resolve their differences. But the questions, which were not publicly revealed, asked for explanations of matters outside the court record, the judge said.

Superior Court Judge Curtis Rappe told jurors their questions could not be answered because they were seeking additional evidence.

He had offered earlier to allow attorneys to present additional arguments if that would help, but he abandoned that plan after seeing the questions.

"Is there anybody who thinks that further deliberations would help?" he asked the panel.

"I do," said one woman. "We're kind of close on some counts."

She was quickly joined by three others who raised their hands and urged further deliberations. But two more members of the panel then said they doubted any progress could be made.

"People seem ready to leave and are set on certain views," said one woman. "We talked

The Mercury News
News Article
February 21, 2006

News

- Breaking News
- Local News
- San Jose/Valley
- Central Coast
- Peninsula
- Alameda County
- California
- Politics
- Nation
- World
- Obituaries
- Education
- Health / Science
- Lottery
- Weird News
- Photos of the Day
- Special Reports
- Iraq: The Aftermath

Opinion

Business

Sports

Entertainment

Life & Style

ONLINE EXTRAS

Past articles

Newsletters

Newspaper Ads Online

Coupons

More & Directions

409530

CCI 006124

[Traffic Reports](#)[Weather](#)[Yellow Pages](#)[Discussion Boards](#)[Blogs](#)[Today's Front Page](#)**SITE SERVICES**[RSS Feeds](#)[Contact Us](#)[Feedback](#)[Site Map](#)[Advertise](#)[Print Services](#)[Jobs at MN.com](#)[Buy Photos](#)[Ethics Policy](#)

this morning and they said they'd made up their minds."

After conferring with lawyers, the judge said he wanted them to try again.

"Maybe you need to sit down and see if there is common ground and if you can make any progress," he said.

If verdicts are reached, they would not be announced until Wednesday, the judge said, because he will be unavailable.

Wempe, 66, is charged with five counts of molestation involving a now grown man known as Jayson B. between 1990 and 1995. The retired priest has admitted molesting 13 boys in the 1970s and '80s but those charges were dismissed after the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the statute of limitations on the crimes.

The defense alleges the accuser fabricated the later claims to get even with Wempe for molesting his two brothers whose charges were dismissed.

Jayson and his brother, Lee, were in court Tuesday in anticipation of a verdict. Wempe and his family also were present.

[email this](#)[print this](#)[reprint or license this](#)

The Mercury News
News Article
February 21, 2006
(continued)

GET HOME DELIVERY OF
THE MERCURY NEWS

GO >

Ads by Google**Fear No Man**

Discover What The Martial Artists And The Army Don't Want You To Know
www.TopSecretTraining.com

Positive Action

Science-based program that treats and prevents violence and bullying.
www.positiveaction.net


Self Defense Products

Mace, Stun Guns, Tasers, and more - Self-Defense Product Super Store
www.defenseproducts101.com

REAL Cities

Visit other Real Cities sites

About The Mercury News | Mercury News Jobs | About the Real Cities Network | Terms of Use & Privacy St
Copyright | RSS Feeds



2:12 PM PST, February 24, 2006

Los Angeles Times
News Article
February 23, 2006



California | Local News

Wempe Is Convicted on 1 Count

A mistrial on four other charges against the pedophile priest is declared when the jury can't reach verdicts. He could face a new trial.

By Jessica Garrison and Jean Guccione, Times Staff Writers
February 23 2006

The pedophile priest whom Cardinal Roger M. Mahony said he regretted returning to the ministry was found guilty Wednesday of one count of molesting a boy, marking the first significant criminal conviction of a Los Angeles cleric since the church's sexual abuse scandal erupted four years ago.

Michael Edwin Wempe, forced into retirement from the Los Angeles Archdiocese, hung his head as the guilty verdict was read. Superior Court Judge Curtis Rappe ordered the Catholic cleric into custody.

ADVERTISEMENT Wempe, 66, has admitted sexually abusing 13 boys during his 36-year career in the archdiocese — but denied that he abused the boy whose allegations landed him in court.

The case garnered close attention because it came as attorneys for the archdiocese were in settlement talks with more than 560 people suing the church for failing to protect them from abuse by priests. Such a settlement would almost surely be record-breaking, likely to reach hundreds of millions of dollars.

It also marked the first time victims of a serial abuser have come into open court to testify. Prosecutors had filed cases against nearly a dozen Los Angeles clerics in 2003, but the cases were dismissed when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a state law that lifted the statute of limitations for child abuse prosecutions.

The Wempe trial focused renewed attention on Mahony's handling of molesting priests. The cardinal has admitted that he erred when he allowed Wempe to return to the ministry after sending him for treatment for pedophilia in 1987.

The verdict "sends a message to the archdiocese regarding this defendant," Deputy Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks said. Wempe wouldn't have had an opportunity to commit the crime if his predatory background had been revealed earlier, Hicks said.

Richard Farnell, who represents six of the 13 men Wempe has admitted abusing plus the current accuser, said the guilty verdict was "an incredible validation of their feelings about Wempe, and further than that about Mahony."

"This is less an indictment of Wempe than of Mahony," he said. "He obviously did not do the right thing. He covered up for his own selfish benefit.... He knew Wempe was a pedophile and instead of doing the right thing, which called for law enforcement to be contacted, Mahony put him out there and failed to warn parishioners."

The jury found Wempe guilty on one count of child molestation but deadlocked on four others.

Both sides claimed partial victory in a case that could send the retiree to prison for a

HOME

Site Map

California/Local

Los Angeles
Orange County
S.F. Valley
Ventura County
Inland Empire
Community Papers
Burbank Leader
Crescenta Valley
Glendale
Huntington Beach
La Cañada Valley
Laguna Beach
Newport Beach

NEWS

California | Local
National
World
Entertainment News
Business
Sports
Politics
Opinion
Columnists
Print Edition
 What is RSS?

Calendarlive

Travel
Real Estate
West Magazine
House & Home
Health
Food
Car Culture
Obituaries
Crossword, Sudoku
All Sections
Corrections

BUY, SELL & MORE

Jobs
Cars
Homes
Rentals
Personals
Deals at Local Stores

Coupons
Newspaper Ads

PLACE AN AD

MEMBER SERVICES

Sign Up

Log In

Help

L.A. Times Archives

HOME DELIVERY


Customer Support

Subscribe to L.A.
Times

Account Info


Los Angeles Times
News Article
February 23, 2006
(continued)

TRUMP INTERNATIONAL HOTEL & TOWER LAS VEGAS



CLICK BELOW TO REGISTER

REGISTER NOW!



maximum of three years. He has served a year while he awaited trial.

Wempe's lawyer, Leonard Levine, has said the victim, now 26 and known in court as Jayson B., made up the allegations to avenge his brothers, who Wempe has admitting abusing. Under the statute of limitations, the priest could not be prosecuted for the decades-old crimes.

Levine said his client was subjected to "a personal vendetta" by the accuser. "That's a natural emotion," Levine said. "But that's not the rule of law."

Levine said his client, who has diabetes and a heart condition, was "disappointed" by the guilty verdict but grateful to jurors for looking at each count and failing to convict on four of them.

Wempe did not testify in his own defense during the five-week trial that had men weeping on the stand as they told how the charming, motorcycle-riding priest had abused them, and forever warped their ability to trust and be intimate.

In 1987, Mahony sent Wempe for psychiatric treatment after Wempe's supervisor accused him of "indiscreet conduct with young boys," but then restored him to the ministry — a decision that he has said publicly he now regrets.

After six months at a treatment center in New Mexico — therapy that Wempe maintained cured him — Mahony assigned him to the chaplaincy at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. He remained there until he retired in 2002, when the clergy sex scandal erupted and Wempe's victims began to come forward.

A year later, in June 2003, he was charged with 42 counts of child sexual molestation, but the case was dismissed after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that

California's law extending the statute of limitations was unconstitutional.

Weeks after that decision, Wempe's current accuser — whose two older brothers had just lost their day in court against Wempe — came forward and claimed he had been abused in the 1990s, within the statute of limitations.

Wempe is one of at least three priests accused — and the first convicted — of abusing children after they were sent to therapy and returned to active ministry.

Wempe's trial also has served as a curtain raiser for the lawsuits, some of which could go before juries this year. After the verdict, both sides in those cases sought to frame the outcome as favorable to their cause.

The archdiocese released a statement that apologized for Wempe's behavior but said it now has procedures in place to prevent abuse.

"Father Michael Wempe's conviction cannot restore the trust and innocence stolen from his victims, but hopefully this verdict may provide them some measure of justice and comfort. To those he abused, we again apologize, and we assure them of our support and of our firm resolve to continue to employ effective means of preventing all forms of abuse in our church," the statement said.

The jury took four days to decide Wempe's fate. Late on Friday, they said they had a verdict on one count — the charge that Wempe orally copulated his accuser in his car sometime between 1993 and 1995 — but were deadlocked on four others.

The judge sent them back for more deliberations, but they were still unable to reach a consensus. They came close to acquitting Wempe on one count, voting 11 to 1 that he was not guilty of one lewd-conduct charge. On two other charges, they voted 7 to 5 that he was guilty. On the fifth count, some thought guilty, some thought innocent, and some could not make up their minds.

The judge declared a mistrial on those charges. Prosecutors said they would decide by the March 10 sentencing hearing whether to retry Wempe on those counts.

All of the jurors declined to comment on how they reached their verdict. They left through a rear door to avoid reporters.

The victim and a brother who accompanied him to court Wednesday also declined to comment. Both men, wearing dark jackets and sitting in the front row, remained expressionless as the verdict was read. Later, Hicks described the victim as "elated" at the conviction.

The support group Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests issued a statement calling on Wempe to "search his conscience and disclose to the police, prosecutors and the public what he knows about Cardinal Roger Mahony and church officials' cover-ups of sex crimes in the church."

Los Angeles Times
News Article
February 23, 2006
(continued)

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

San Jose Mercury News

Subscriber Services

The Mercury News

MercuryNews.com

FREE
reconditioned
PHONE

when you buy
a 60 Unit
Airtime Card
for only \$19.99

The Mercury News
News Article
May 5, 2006

Search Recent News ☐ Archives ☐ Web for

Go

- ☐ Jobs
- ☐ Cars
- ☐ Real Estate
- ☐ Apartments
- ☐ Local Shopping
- ☐ All Classifieds
 - Create an Ad
 - Find an Ad
 - Pets
- ☐ Dating

Back to Home > News >

Breaking News

Posted on Fri, May. 05, 2006

☐ email this ☐ print this ☐ reprint or license this

Retired LA Roman Catholic priest receives 3-year prison sentence

ROBERT JABLON
Associated Press

LOS ANGELES - Retired Roman Catholic priest Michael Wempe was sentenced to three years in state prison Friday on one count of child molestation in a case that began with his admission that he had sexually abused many other boys decades ago.

Superior Court Judge Curtis B. Rappe sentenced the 66-year-old priest to the maximum term allowed by law, but that was reduced to just 479 days after deductions for the time he already served behind bars and credits for prison work and good behavior.

The defense estimated Wempe could be paroled in half that time.

He also was fined \$600 and must register as a sex offender.

Wempe said nothing at the hearing, and defense attorney Leonard Levine said his client would not make statements of remorse because they would sound "hollow" and because of a pending lawsuit against Wempe.

"There are no winners in this case," Levine said. "There are just people trying to put their lives back here and move on."

The defense agreed not to appeal the sentence or seek a new trial under a deal with prosecutors, who said they wouldn't refile four other charges over which a jury had deadlocked.

Outside court, the victim's older brother, known only as Lee B., said he was disappointed by the sentence and argued that Wempe remains a danger to children.

After his release "he'll go right back to work," Lee said. "He has the ability, with the Internet and the dangers that lurk on there, to accumulate more victims."

AS:
Ass
UNI
Bac
Bac
Bac
Bac
Bac
Bac
Bac
Bac
Bac
Bac

GR/
Mas
Mas

News

- Breaking News
- Crime & Courts
- Local News
- San Jose/Valley
- Central Coast
- Peninsula
- Alameda County
- California
- Politics
- Nation
- World
- Obituaries
- Education
- Health / Science
- Lottery
- Weird News
- Photos

Special Reports

- NEW! Gas Prices
- Immigration Debate
- Election 2006

Opinion

Business

Sports

Entertainment

Life & Style

ONLINE EXTRAS

Newspaper Ads Online

Blogs

Podcasts

409535

5/9/2006

Photo / Video
 RSS Feeds
 Discussion Boards
 Traffic Reports
 Weather
 Past articles
 Newsletters
 Coupons
 Today's Front Page

SITE SERVICES

Maps & Directions
 Yellow Pages
 Contact Us
 Feedback
 Site Map
 Advertise
 Print Services
 Jobs at MN.com
 Buy Photos
 Ethics Policy

The trial played out over four weeks against the backdrop of an ongoing scandal in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles - the nation's largest - which is facing numerous lawsuits over allegations that it failed to protect children from molesting priests.

In his statement, Lee B. accused the Catholic Church and Cardinal Roger Mahony of concealing abuse by priests, putting them into "pedophile recycling camps" for therapy and of using stall tactics in prosecutions of priests.

Spokesman Tod Tamberg said the archdiocese has "repeatedly apologized and explained its actions as to how the (Wempe) case was mishandled over the years" but there now are "effective policies" for dealing with priestly abuse.

"We hope that Wempe's conviction and sentencing brings some measure of healing and consolation to the young people that he abused," Tamberg said.

A U.S. Supreme Court ruling upholding a statute of limitations on old claims resulted in dismissal of 42 molestation counts against Wempe involving 13 other boys in the 1970s and '80s. His lawyers acknowledged his guilt on those charges but said he went into church-ordered treatment 20 years ago and returned a changed man, never molesting after that.

REDACTED

The case on which the priest was tried involved only one victim, referred to as who claimed he was 11 when the abuse started in the 1990s, during a time that Wempe was a chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center.

Wempe's lawyers suggested that Jayson fabricated his claims in retribution for the abuse of his two older brothers whose cases were thrown out.

"We felt the evidence showed they did not occur," Levine said outside court of the alleged incidents.

But it was the earlier crimes that took up the bulk of the trial as grown men came to recount tearfully the abuse they said damaged them for life.

Wempe, seated across the courtroom, cried with them.

However, he showed no emotion during the sentencing hearing when Jayson's mother and brother read statements condemning Wempe as someone who abused their family's trust and destroyed their faith and sense of security.

"You have given so much grief and misery to us," the mother, identified in court only as REDACTED told Wempe.

Prosecutor Todd Hicks also read an April 10 statement from Jayson B. saying that because of Wempe's abuse he is still unable to find "any comfort or happiness in my life."

Wempe did not look at the speakers.

Hicks also read a statement from the eldest brother, Mark B., saying he felt responsible for his siblings' abuse because he said nothing about his own.

"Some days I have difficulty looking at myself in the mirror," he said.

The Mercury News
 News Article
 May 5, 2006
 (continued)

409536

CCI 006130

All three brothers said they still suffer from nightmares, panic attacks or chest pains, and an inability to trust.

Two other victims also submitted statements into the record. One said of Wempe: "I can only hope that every night you are tortured in your dreams by your actions, as I have been every day."

The Mercury News
News Article
May 5, 2006
(continued)



Make Your Donation Today

Help Rebuild Lives & Communities in Hurricane
Affected States.

www.BushClintonKatrinaFund.org

Public Service Ads by Go



[About The Mercury News](#) | [Mercury News Jobs](#) | [About the Real Cities Network](#) | [Terms of Use & Privacy St](#)
[Copyright](#) | [RSS Feeds](#)

409537

5/8/2006

CCI 006131


[Web](#) [MSNBC](#)

[Alerts](#) [Newsletters](#) [RSS](#) [Help](#)
[MSN Home](#) [Hotmail](#) [Sign In](#)

[MSNBC Home](#) » [Local news](#) » [Los Angeles, CA](#)
[KNBC-TV](#) | [Your Weather](#)

KNBC-TV
News Article
May 5, 2006

KNBC-TV—Los Angeles, CA

• [MAKE THIS YOUR LOCAL NEWS](#)

Local News

[Your local news](#)
[Other cities](#)
[Local Business](#)

News Video

[U.S. News](#)
[World News](#)
[Business](#)
[Sports](#)
[Entertainment](#)
[Tech / Science](#)
[Health](#)
[Weather](#)
[Travel](#)
[Blogs Etc.](#)
[Local News](#)
[Newsweek](#)
[Multimedia](#)
[Most Popular](#)
[NBC NEWS](#)
[MSNBC TV](#)
[Today Show](#)
[Nightly News](#)
[Meet the Press](#)
[Dateline NBC](#)

• [Disable Fly-out](#)

Former Priest Sentenced To Three Years In Prison

KNBC-TV

6:54 p.m. PDT May 5, 2006

LOS ANGELES - A former Catholic priest was sentenced Friday to three years in prison for molesting a boy in the 1990s. **Jan. 23 Images: Opening Statements | Video**

Michael Edwin Wempe will also have to register as a sex offender.

The sentence ordered by Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Curtis Rappe was the maximum.

But with credit for good behavior and time served in jail, the ex-priest will have 616 days taken off his sentence.

In exchange for prosecutors agreeing not to retry him on four other counts on which a jury could not reach a verdict, Wempe agreed not to seek a new trial or appeal his conviction, according to Deputy District Attorney Todd Hicks.

The 66-year-old Wempe has been jailed since being convicted Feb. 22 of one count of



MORE LOCAL LINKS FROM NBC4.1

- [KNBC TV Listings](#)
- [NBC4.TV News](#)
- [NBC4.TV Local and National Slides](#)
- [NBC4.TV Investigations, Special R](#)
- [NBC4.tv Entertainment](#)
- [NBC4.tv Weather](#)
- [NBC4.tv Free E-News Signup](#)

RELATED STORIES | What's this?

409538

21010002

Shopping

Jobs

Personals

with PerfectMatch.com

Autos

Real Estate

with HomePages.com

Not home for
the evening news?

NBC
NIGHTLY
NEWS
NEWCAST
CHRISTIAN WILLIAMS

having oral sex with a boy in the defendant's c during a driving lesson sometime between 1993 and 1995.

Wempe was initially charged in June 2003 with sexually molesting five boys in the 1970s and 1980s, but those counts were dropped after the U.S. Supreme Court invalidated a California law that had extended the statute of limitations on sex crimes.

Wempe was then charged in September 2003 with the crimes from the 1990s.

Wempe's attorney, Leonard Levine, told jurors during the trial that his client denied molesting the boy in the 1990s but admitted that Wempe had molested the youth's two older brothers in the 1970s and 1980s.

Levine contended that Wempe overcame his attraction to young boys after being counseled at a retreat for priests in New Mexico in 1987, and he alleged that the young man the ex-priest was accused of molesting came forward to avenge his two brothers.

The man, now in his 20s, testified he was repeatedly molested by Wempe in the early 1990s, beginning when he was 11 and ending when he was 15. At the time, Wempe was assigned to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center as a hospital chaplain.

In a statement released shortly after the verdict, the Archdiocese of Los Angeles apologized to Wempe's victims.

"Father Michael Wempe's conviction cannot restore the trust and innocence stolen from his victims, but hopefully this verdict may provide them some measure of justice and comfort."

- February 21, 2006: Judge Orders Jurors To Continue Deliberations In Wempe Trial
- February 17, 2006: Jurors Reach Verdict On One Count In Wempe Trial
- January 30, 2006: Accuser In Wempe Case Says Abuses Escalated

- Ex-Priest Gets 3 Years In Abuse
- Retired priest gets three-years molestation
- Ex-educator sentenced to prison laundering charges

MOST POPULAR

Most Viewed - • Top Rated •

- Iranian president writes letter
- Last U.S. survivor of Titanic still
- A simple solution to pain at the
- 'Housewives': Andrew pushes I
- Gas price edge higher across L
- Most viewed on MSNBC.com

MORE NEWS FROM YOUR REGION

- Orange County
- Los Angeles (Español)
- Ventura
- Palm Springs
- San Diego
- Other Cities

KNBC-TV
News Article
May 5, 2006
(continued)

Your name

Your e-mail address

Send

Your e-mail address and/or phone number
Leave your name or hometown blank if you
published.

409539

5/12/2006

CCI 006133



search

Go

10:44 AM PDT, May 8, 2006

HOME
Site Map

California/Local

Los Angeles
Orange County
S.F. Valley
Ventura County
Inland Empire
Community Papers
Burbank Leader
Crescenta Valley
Glendale
Huntington Beach
La Cañada Valley
Laguna Beach
Newport Beach

NEWS

California | Local
National
World
Entertainment News
Business
Sports
Politics
Opinion
Columnists
Print Edition
RSS What is RSS?

Calendarlive

Travel

West Magazine

House & Garden

Health

Food

Car Culture

Obituaries

Crossword, Sudoku

All Sections

Corrections

BUY, SELL & MORE

Jobs

Cars

Real Estate

Apartments

Personals

Deals at Local
Stores

AT&T CallVantage

Unlimited nationwide calling Only \$29.99

*Available online only. Click for details.

Los Angeles Times
News Article
May 8, 2006

California | Local News

Priest Gets 3 Years in Molestation

Michael Wempe's case, the first major trial in the L.A. Archdiocese's sex abuse scandal, ends as settlement talks with hundreds continue.

By Jessica Garrison and Jonathan Abrams, Times Staff Writers
May 6, 2006

A pedophile priest whom Cardinal Roger M. Mahony returned to the ministry after learning of his interest in children was sentenced to three years in prison Friday, bringing to a close Los Angeles' first high-profile trial since the church's abuse scandal exploded four years ago.

Father Michael Edwin Wempe, 66, was led into court in handcuffs and sat expressionless in his brown county jail jumpsuit as Judge Curtis B. Rappe told him he would have to register as a sex offender for life because of his conviction for molesting a 16-year-old boy.

ADVERTISEMENT

AT&T CallVantage

Unlimited nationwide calling
Only \$29.99/month



*Available online only.
Click for details.

The new at&t

The retired priest agreed not to appeal or seek a new trial. In exchange, the district attorney's office will not retry him on four other counts of molestation that his jury was unable to decide.

He was given the maximum sentence, but has already served about 600 days and so will be in prison for only about a year more — a sentence that some of his victims said was far too short.

Wempe has admitted to sexually abusing 13 boys during his 36-year career in the Los Angeles Archdiocese, but he could be tried only for molesting a single boy because the other crimes were too

old. In the current case, he had denied abusing the younger brother of two men he had acknowledged molesting as youths.

"At long last, you will be introduced to some measure of justice," the older brother of the victim in this case told Wempe during the sentencing hearing. He and other victims who testified also had harsh words for the archdiocese and Mahony.

"If the archdiocese had done the right thing ... I would have been spared years of despondency," he added. "Because of this, they bear as much responsibility for your crimes as you do."

Wempe's hair and beard were scruffy and he appeared much thinner than during his February trial. In the probation report submitted during sentencing, officials noted that the retired priest is a diabetic who had open heart surgery in 1999 and takes daily medication.

409540

CCI 006134

**Coupons
Newspaper Ads**
PLACE AN AD
MEMBER SERVICES
Sign Up
Log In
Help
Contact Us
L.A. Times Archives
HOME DELIVERY
Customer Support
**Subscribe to L.A.
Times**

ADVERTISEMENT
**Want to stop hair
loss?**

Check out this article
"Tips on how to stop
hair loss" by Jai
Bains. Get the facts
and myths relating...
Restorationhair.com

**Tomorrows Hot
Stock Picks**

Hot Stock Picks, Tips,
Penny Stocks, and
Investment Ideas.
www.RocketStockPicks....

Buy a link here

Los Angeles Times
News Article
May 8, 2006
(continued)

The report also said Wempe has been taking Prozac for three years "to calm his nerves."

Wempe did not testify at his trial, but in his probation report, officers wrote that he had said "this case has not only hurt him, but it has hurt the priesthood."

"He related that he does not want to hurt the priesthood and he does not want to hurt the church," the report said.

The trial focused renewed attention on the cardinal's handling of molesting priests. Mahony sent Wempe to therapy in 1987 after doubts arose about his questionable behavior, but allowed him to remain a priest until 2002 without warning parishioners. The therapy came more than 20 years after Wempe was ordained and more than 15 years after his first admitted victims entered his life.

Archdiocese spokesman Tod Tamberg said Friday the church hoped "that this conviction and sentencing brings some measure of healing to his victims".

He added that the "archdiocese has expressed remorse and asked for forgiveness for mistakes it made in dealing with Father Wempe."

Wempe's trial comes as attorneys for the archdiocese are in settlement talks with more than 560 people suing the church for failing to protect them from abuse by priests.

Such a settlement probably would reach into the hundreds of millions of dollars and break records.

The case also marked the first time that victims of a serial abuser came into open court to testify. Prosecutors had filed cases against nearly a dozen Los Angeles priests in 2003, but they were dismissed when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a state law that had lifted the statute of limitations for child abuse prosecutions.

On Friday, Wempe's attorney, Leonard Levine, said the retired priest would make no statement of remorse or address the court in any way because of civil litigation pending against him.

Outside the courtroom, Levine again denied that the priest had committed the crime for which he was convicted.

"Since 1986, we believe Michael has not molested any individuals. There have been no allegations except for the one person who came forward. We believe the evidence was and is there to dispute that allegation, but we accept the jury's verdict and the sentence and will move on."

But Wempe's victims said the sentence was far too lenient given the pain he has caused.

"I am here today to tell you how one man — Michael Wempe — has damaged ... our family as a whole," testified the mother of two of Wempe's victims. She recalled how he entered their lives the year her husband died and then took advantage of her sons.

Turning to Wempe, she said: "You have given so much grief and misery to us, and we are only one family."

Wempe sat expressionless and did not make eye contact with any of the speakers. But his sister, who faithfully sat through the trial, got up and left the courtroom at that point.

Prosecutor Todd Hicks said he did not know where Wempe would serve his time. That determination will be made in the next few weeks by the state Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

In Massachusetts, defrocked pedophile priest John Geoghan — despite being in protective custody — was murdered in prison by an inmate who said he had been abused as a child.

409541

After serving his time, Wempe's probation report says, he plans to return to his condominium in Seal Beach where he cares for his aging mother. He still has a \$1,500 monthly pension from the church.

MOST E-MAILED

- Looking for an End to Her Skid
- Pug o' my heart
- A Natural Force

MORE CALIFORNIA NEWS

- Big Sunday Stretches Across L.A.
- Disney Loses Its Appetite for Happy Meal Tie-Ins
- L.A.'s Busiest Crooks to Do More Time

Los Angeles Times
News Article
May 8, 2006
(continued)

PARTNERS:   Copyright 2006 Los Angeles Times | Privacy Policy | Terms of Service | Advertise | Home De

409542

5/8/2006

CCI 006136



REDACTED

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

3424
Wilshire
BoulevardLos Angeles
California
90010-2202

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHENTICATION

CASE: Michael Edwin Wempe
Report of Alleged *Graviora Delicta*

By this instrument, I certify that the documentation herewith transmitted to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith regarding the above-captioned case, beginning with the Table of Contents and ending with this Certificate, are either original writings or exact duplicates of documents on file in the archives of the Curia of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Given at Los Angeles, California, this 24th day of May in the year of our Lord 2006.

ARCHDIOCESAN SEAL

REDACTED

409543



APOSTOLIC NUNCIATURE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

3339 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008-3687

No.1568.....

March 12, 2007

This No. Should Be Prefixed to the Answer

REDACTED

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90010-2202

Dear REDACTED

I acknowledge your kind letter of March 6, 2007, with enclosure.

Rest assured that the sealed letter concerning the **Reverend Michael Edwin Wempe** (*notification of dismissal from the clerical state*), has been transmitted through the diplomatic pouch, to His Eminence William J. Cardinal Levada, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

With cordial regards and prayerful best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Archbishop Pietro Sambi
Apostolic Nuncio

409544



FILE COPY

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

REDACTED

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

Re: Prot. No. 659/2004 – 23647
Michael Edwin WEMPE
Notification of *ex officio* Dismissal from the Clerical State

6 March 2007

Cardinal William Joseph Levada
Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
00120 Vatican City

Your Eminence:

I write in reply to your above-referenced letter, dated 12 July 2006, by which you informed His Eminence Cardinal Roger Mahony that His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI has decreed the dismissal *ex officio et in poenam* of Michael Edwin Wempe from the clerical state.

Wempe was duly notified of the Holy Father's decision, and on 17 February 2007 he was officially presented with the decree of dismissal for him to sign, together with an English-language translation of the Latin document. Wempe refused to sign the document, stating that he would never place his signature on it since he did not request it and since he does not agree with it. He does, however, understand that, as stated in no. 7 of the decree itself, even without his signature, the Holy Father's decision remains in force and all the effects of the dismissal remain intact.

Despite his refusal to sign the decree, Wempe did retain a photocopy of the document, together with the aforementioned English translation.

I herewith return to the Congregation, although unsigned by the dismissed priest as explained above, a copy of the decree duly signed by the Episcopal Vicar for the Clergy, Monsignor Gabriel Gonzalez, who made the official presentation of the document to Wempe on the date shown above his signature.

Thanking Your Eminence for your kind assistance in this difficult matter, and assuring you of my prayerful best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,
REDACTED

(enclosure)

409545



FILE COPY

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

REDACTED

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

CONFIDENTIAL

RE: Dismissal of Michael Wempe from the Clerical State,
Annotation of Baptismal Record

6 March 2007

REDACTED

Saint Patrick's Church
P. O. Box 383
Estherville, IA 51334

REDACTED

Michael Edwin Wempe, born on 1 November 1939, was baptized at St. Patrick's Church on 26 November 1939; a copy of his certificate of baptism in our possession lists his name as "Edwin Michael Wempe." On 30 April 1966 he was ordained to the Sacred Order of Priesthood for service to the Archdiocese of Los Angeles in California.

On 30 June 2006 His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI dismissed Father Wempe from the clerical state and dispensed him from all obligations connected to Holy Orders. I would now ask you kindly to make a notation of this dismissal and dispensation on Wempe's baptismal record. The notation may read in these or similar words:

*Dismissed by Pope Benedict XVI from the clerical state
and dispensed from all obligations of Holy Orders,
effective 30 June 2006.*

I would also ask you kindly to notify me when the above notation has been made.

Thanking you for your assistance in this matter, and with every good wish, I am

*Recorded in Baptismal
Records of Michael Wempe
Estherville, Iowa*

March 10, 2007

REDACTED

Sincerely yours in Christ
REDACTED

409546



FILE COPY

REDACTED

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

5424
Wilshire
BoulevardLos Angeles
California
90010-2202

6 March 2007

The Most Reverend Pietro Sambì
Apostolic Nuncio to the United States of America
3339 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

RE: Michael Edwin WEMPE
Notification of Dismissal from the Clerical State

Your Excellency,

Enclosed is a letter addressed to Cardinal William Joseph Levada, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. The letter advises the Congregation that the Reverend Michael Edwin Wempe, dismissed *ex officio et in poenam* from the clerical state by His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI, has been duly notified of the Holy Father's decision. With the letter a notarized copy of the decree of dismissal is also being returned to the Congregation.

I respectfully ask you to forward this correspondence to the Congregation.

With gratitude for your kind assistance in this matter, and assuring you of my prayerful best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ.
REDACTED

(enclosure)

409547



FILE COPY

REDACTED

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

CONFIDENTIAL

RE: Dismissal of Michael Wempe from the Clerical State,
Annotation of Baptismal Record

6 March 2007

REDACTED

Saint Patrick's Church
P. O. Box 383
Estherville, IA 51334

REDACTED

Michael Edwin Wempe, born on 1 November 1939, was baptized at St. Patrick's Church on 26 November 1939; a copy of his certificate of baptism in our possession lists his name as "Edwin Michael Wempe." On 30 April 1966 he was ordained to the Sacred Order of Priesthood for service to the Archdiocese of Los Angeles in California.

On 30 June 2006 His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI dismissed Father Wempe from the clerical state and dispensed him from all obligations connected to Holy Orders. I would now ask you kindly to make a notation of this dismissal and dispensation on Wempe's baptismal record. The notation may read in these or similar words:

*Dismissed by Pope Benedict XVI from the clerical state
and dispensed from all obligations of Holy Orders,
effective 30 June 2006.*

I would also ask you kindly to notify me when the above notation has been made.

Thanking you for your assistance in this matter, and with every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ.

REDACTED

409548

FILE COPY



CONGREGATIO PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

(Dimissio e statu clericali ac dispensatio ab oneribus)

Prot. N. 659/2004

Angolorum in California
(Los Angeles, U.S.A.)

D.nus Michael Edwin WEMPE

Die 30 m. Iunii a. 2006

Summus Pontifex Benedictus, Papa XVI

audita relatione Em.mi et Rev.mi Praefecti huius Congregationis circa gravem agendi rationem supradicti presbyteri facultatibus ministerialibus pollentis in archidioecesi Angolorum in California (v.d. Los Angeles, U.S.A.), praemissis praemittendis, suprema atque inappellabili decisione nullique recursum obnoxia,

decrevit

poenam dimissionis dicto presbytero irrogandam esse.

Eidem presbytero etiam dispensationem concedit ab omnibus oneribus sacrae Ordinationi conexis iuxta sequentes rationes.

1. Dimissio ac dispensatio vim habent ab ipso momento decisionis Romani Pontificis.
2. Dimissionis ac dispensationis Decretum presbytero a competenti Ordinario loci notificetur, cui numquam fas est duo illa elementa seiungere. Idemque insuper secumfert absolutionem a censuris, quatenus opus sit.
3. Notitia dimissionis ac dispensationis adnotetur in Libris baptizatorum parociae praedicti presbyteri.
4. Quod attinet si casus ferat, ad celebrationem canonici matrimonii, applicandae sunt normae quae in Codice Iuris Canonici statuuntur. Ordinarius vero curet ut res caute peragantur sine exteriore apparatu.
5. Auctoritas ecclesiastica, cui spectat Decretum praefato sacerdoti notificare, hunc enixe hortetur, ut vitam Populi Dei, ratione congruendi cum nova eius vivendi condicione, participet, aedificationem praestet et ita probum Ecclesiae filium se exhibeat. Simul autem eidem notum faciat ea quae sequuntur:

- a) presbyter dimissus eo ipso amittit iura statui clericali propria, dignitates et officia ecclesiastica; ceteris obligationibus cum statu clericali conexas non amplius adstringitur;
- b) exclusus manet ab exercitio sacri ministerii, iis exceptis de quibus in can. 976 et 986 § 2 CJC ac propterea nequit homiliam habere, nec potest officium gerere directivum in ambitu pastoralis neve munere administratoris paroecialis fungi;
- c) item nullum munus absolvere potest in Seminariis et in Institutis aequiparatis. In aliis Institutis studiorum gradus superioris, quae quocumque modo dependent ab Auctoritate ecclesiastica, munere directivo vel officio docendi fungi nequit;
- d) in aliis vero Institutis studiorum gradus superioris ab Auctoritate ecclesiastica non dependentibus nullam theologiam disciplinam tradere potest;
- e) in Institutis autem studiorum gradus inferioris dependentibus ab Auctoritate ecclesiastica, munere directivo vel officio docendi fungi nequit. Eadem lege tenetur presbyter dimissus ac dispensatus in tradenda Religione in Institutis eiusdem generis non dependentibus ab Auctoritate ecclesiastica.

6. Ordinarius curet, quantum fieri potest, ne nova condicio presbyteri dimissi fidelibus scandalum praebeat. Attamen, si adest periculum minoribus abutendi, Ordinarius potest factum dimissionis necnon causam canonicam divulgare.

7. Notificatio dimissionis et dispensationis fieri potest vel personaliter per notarium aut ecclesiasticum actuarium vel per «epistulas perscriptas» (*registered*). Sacerdos dimissus unum exemplar restituere debet rite subsignatum ad fidem receptionis et acceptionis eiusdem dimissionis ac dispensationis ac simul etiam praeceptorum, quod si non faciat integer manet effectus huius Decreti.

8. Tempore autem opportuno, Ordinarius competens breviter ad Congregationem de peracta notificatione referat, et si qua tandem fidelium admiratio adsit, prudenti explicatione provideat.

Contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Ex Aedibus Congregationis, die 30 m. Iunii a. 2006

William Card. Levada

Gulielmus Card. LEVADA
Praefectus

** H. Amato*

✠ Angelus AMATO, S.D.B.
Archiep. titularis Silensis
a Secretis

Dies notificationis 17 february 2007

Subsignatio Presbyteri in signum
acceptionis

Gulielmus Card. Levada
Subsignatio Ordinarii



CONGREGATIO
PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

00120 Città del Vaticano,
Palazzo del S. Ufficio

FILE COPY

12 July 2006

PROT. N. 659/2004 - 23647

(In responsione fiat mentio huius numeri)

CONFIDENTIAL

Your Eminence,

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith received your correspondence regarding the case of the **Rev. Michael Edwin WEMPE**, a priest incardinated in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, who has been accused of numerous instances of sexual abuse of minors.

This Dicastery, after a careful and attentive study of the facts presented, and in light of the faculty granted to this Congregation by the Supreme Pontiff to dispense from Article 17 of the *motu proprio Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela* requiring a penal judicial process, decided, on 23 June 2006, to support your request that the above mentioned priest be dismissed from the clerical state *ex officio et in poenam*.

In an audience granted on 30 June 2006, the Holy Father decreed that the Rev. Michael E. Wempe is dismissed *ex officio et in poenam* from the clerical state, and is, moreover, released from all obligations of the Sacred Priesthood, including that of celibacy. Any censures, under which he may be labouring, are remitted by this decree.

You are kindly asked to inform Mr. Wempe of this grave decision according to paragraph 7 of the enclosed decree. A signed and notarized copy of the decree should be returned to this Dicastery at your earliest possible convenience.

With fraternal regards and prayerful best wishes, I remain

Yours fraternally in Christ,

William Card. Levada

William Cardinal LEVADA
Prefect

Enclosures

His Eminence
Roger Card. MAHONY
Archbishop of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90010-2202
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

409551



APOSTOLIC NUNCIATURE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

3339 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008-3687

No.1568.....

May 31, 2006

This No. Should Be Prefixed to the Answer

Dear REDACTED :

Thank you for your kind letter of May 26, 2006, with enclosure.

Rest assured that the sealed packet containing correspondence, including Cardinal Roger Mahony's *votum* with attachment regarding **Reverend Michael E. Wempe, Prot. No. 25.835**, will be duly forwarded through the diplomatic pouch to *Cardinal William Joseph Levada, Prefect, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*.

With cordial regards and prayerful best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours in Christ.
REDACTED

REDACTED

Archdiocese of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90010-2202

409552

CCI 006146



Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of the
Vicar for Canonical Services
Phone: (213) 637-7888
Fax: (213) 637-6888

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

RE: Prot. No. 25.835
Rev. Michael E. Wempe
Accused of *Graviora Delicta*

- 26 May 2006

REDACTED

3339 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

Your Excellency,

Enclosed is a letter, with attachment, from Cardinal Roger Michael Mahony, Archbishop of Los Angeles, addressed to Cardinal William Joseph Levada, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. The letter contains the Cardinal's *votum* in the case of the *graviora delicta* allegedly committed by the Reverend Michael E. Wempe and the attachment contains the Report of these alleged crimes to the Congregation.

I would respectfully ask you to forward these items to the Congregation.

With gratitude for your kind assistance in this matter, and assuring you of my prayerful best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

REDACTED

409553



Archdiocese of Los Angeles

Office of
the Archbishop
(213) 637-7288

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

VOTUM OF THE ORDINARY OF INCARDINATION,
CARDINAL ROGER MICHAEL MAHONY,
ARCHBISHOP OF LOS ANGELES IN CALIFORNIA

Re: Prot. No. 659/2004 – 21302
The Reverend Michael Edwin Wempe

26 May 2006

Cardinal William Joseph Levada
Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
00120 Vatican City

Your Eminence:

I am writing in reply to the Congregation's letter of 13 June last regarding the above-captioned case and am pleased to send the information requested.

As noted in my letter of 17 November 2004, Father Wempe has been accused of numerous episodes of sexual abuse of minors under the age of sixteen, all of which would constitute crimes reserved to the Supreme Tribunal of the Congregation of the Doctrine for the Faith according to the norms set forth in the *Motu Proprio Sacramentorum Sanctitatis Tutela*.

In 2003, the State of California had begun a criminal process against Wempe, citing 42 counts of sexual abuse dating back to the 1970s and the 1980s; this case, however, was dismissed when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a California State law that had sought to allow retroactive prosecution of cases otherwise barred from prosecution by the expiry of the statute of limitations. Nonetheless, a further accusation was then made by the younger brother of two of Wempe's earlier alleged victims; this new complainant alleged that he had been sexually abused by Wempe on five occasions in the 1990s. These new crimes were not barred from prosecution by the statute of limitations, and Father Wempe was consequently charged with four counts of lewd conduct and one count of sexual molestation against this minor boy. In the ensuing criminal trial, Wempe was found guilty on the charge of sexual molestation, but the jury was unable to reach a decision on the other four charges. The verdict on this one charge was handed down in February 2006, and Wempe was sentenced on 5 May 2006 to three years in prison.

With the conclusion of Father Wempe's criminal trial and his sentencing, the canonical investigation into the various claims advanced against him has also been completed and I forward herewith to the Congregation the results of that investigation. As Your Eminence will see, Father Wempe's guilt of the many accusations made against him (with one exception: that of the newest allegation, which — ironically — is the one for which he was eventually brought to trial and found guilty) is fully borne out both in this report and by Father Wempe's own admission.

409554

Votum of Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
Regarding WEMPE, Prot. No. 659/2004 - 21302
Page 2 of 2


Following Father Wempe's trial and conviction, I had hoped that he would voluntarily petition our Holy Father for laicization. However, after being approached in this regard, Wempe has declined to make such a petition. He stated that although he recognizes that his past misdeeds make his dismissal from the clerical state inevitable, he could not bring himself to be the one to make such a petition. In his own words: "My priesthood is too precious to me to sign it away myself."

Based therefore on the results of the canonical investigation, and on Father Wempe's refusal to seek laicization voluntarily, my *votum* in the matter is that Wempe be dismissed *ex officio* from the clerical state by His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI. Although the measures already taken with regard to Wempe — viz., his withdrawal from active ministry and the revocation of his priestly faculties — seem sufficient for his personal correction in the matter, the need to repair the scandal given and the obligation to restore justice cannot be sufficiently met without further action on the part of the Church. Indeed, given the egregious nature of the offenses committed, their great number, the ample publicity surrounding them and the immense harm done to both the Christian faithful and the community at large, I believe that anything short of an *ex officio* dismissal will not adequately resolve the issue nor bring it to a proper closure.

In accordance, then, with the norms set forth in *Sacramentorum Sanctitatis Tutela*, I submit the case of the Reverend Michael Edwin Wempe to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith for your decision and with my *votum* as expressed above.

Thanking you for your valued assistance in this difficult matter, I assure you of my prayers and best wishes.

Sincerely yours in Christ,


Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

Enclosure



CONGREGATIO
PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

00120 Città del Vaticano,
Palazzo del S. Uffizio

13 June 2005

659/2004 – 21302

PROT. N.

(In responsione fiat mentio huius numeri)

CONFIDENTIAL

Your Eminence,

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith received on 27 November 2004 the case regarding the alleged sexual abuse of a minor by **Reverend Michael Edwin WEMPE**, a priest of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. **REDACTED** submitted a summary of the case and indicated that you would forward the evidence under separate cover.

We write at this time to request the complete *Acta* of the case. Though written summaries are helpful, actual documents are necessary in order for the Congregation to examine the case. Each element of the summary that you have already submitted should be supported by the relevant documentation either in the original form or in an authentic copy.

In addition to the requested information, it would also be important to the Congregation to have your *Votum* in the matter as this is essential in our study of the case.

With prayerful support and best wishes, I remain

Yours sincerely in Christ,

✠ Angelo AMATO, SDB
Titular Archbishop of Sila
Secretary

His Eminence
Roger Cardinal MAHONY
Archbishop of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90010-2202
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



3339 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20008-3687

APOSTOLIC NUNCIATURE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

25.835

November 21, 2004

No.

This No. Should Be Prefixed to the Answer

Dear Monsignor Cox:

I acknowledge your kind letter of November 18, 2004, with enclosures.

Rest assured that the correspondence concerning **Reverend Michael E. Wempe**, including a check in amount \$500.00 for the taxa, will be duly forwarded through the diplomatic pouch to His Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect, Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

With cordial regards and best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo
Apostolic Nuncio

Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
Vicar for Clergy
Archdiocese of Los Angeles
3424 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90010-2241

NOV 29 2004

409557

CCI 006151



FILE

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

REDACTED

3424
Wilshire
Boulevard

Los Angeles
California
90010-2202

November 18, 2004

Archbishop Gabriel Montalvo, J.C.D.
Apostolic Nunciature
3339 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

RE: Reverend Michael E. Wempe

Your Excellency:

Enclosed, please find a letter from Cardinal Roger M. Mahony to Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger at the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, regarding Reverend Michael E. Wempe. With his letter are copies of the completed summary pages requested by the Congregation. All materials are submitted in triplicate.

Cardinal Mahony is seeking the assistance of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in this matter.

Would you please be so kind as to forward this to the Congregation on our behalf?

Also enclosed is a check made out to the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith to cover the usual *taxa* in such matters.

Thank you very much for your kind attention to this matter. May God continue to bless you!

Yours in Christ,

Monsignor Craig A. Cox, J.C.D.
Vicar for Clergy

enclosures

409558

176246

Check Date: 16.Nov.2004

ACCLA

Check No.

Invoice Number	Invoice Date	Voucher ID	Gross Amount	Discount Available	Paid Amount
517 VC	15.Nov.2004	00118811	500.00	0.00	500.00

Vendor Number	Name			Total Discounts	
0000002838	Congregation For The Doctrine			\$0.00	
Check Number	Date		Total Amount	Discounts Taken	Total Paid Amount
	16.Nov.2004		\$500.00	\$0.00	\$500.00



The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles
 (A Corporation Sole)
 3424 Wilshire Blvd.
 Los Angeles, California 90010-2241
 (213) 637-7691

REDACTED

176246

Date
 November 16, 2004

Pay Amount
 \$ 500.00***

Pay ****FIVE HUNDRED AND XX / 100 US DOLLAR****

To The
 Order Of

REDACTED

CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE
 of the Faith
 Piazza Del S Offizio II
 00120 Vatican City

REDACTED

409559



REDACTED

Archdiocese of Los Angeles

3424
Wilshire
BoulevardLos Angeles
California
90010-2202

17 November 2004

His Eminence
Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect
Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
Piazza Del S. Ufficio, 11
00120 VATICAN CITY

Re: Rev. Michael Edwin Wempe

Your Eminence:

It is with deep regret that I submit this report on alleged violations that fall under Article 4 of *Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela*, which involve a priest of this Archdiocese, Rev. Michael E. Wempe.

The numerous alleged victims are all males of pre- and early pubescent age. A criminal trial citing 42 counts of sexual abuse against five of the complainants was dismissed when the U.S. Supreme Court nullified the law which attempted to allow the retroactive prosecution of cases barred by the statute of limitation. A new criminal prosecution is in progress for alleged acts of sexual abuse against one complainant that are not barred by the statute of limitation.

Father Wempe has admitted to delictal acts involving some of the complainants, but strongly denies the accusations in the current criminal prosecution. Most of the denunciations we have received were made before the promulgation of the *motu proprio*, and involve actions that would be barred from a penal process by prescription.

Father Wempe was granted early retirement at age 62 in view of the moral impossibility of allowing him to continue in ministry owing to the previously reported sexual misconduct. In view of all these circumstances, as well as the public notoriety occasioned by the civil processes, the good of the Church requires that the strongest available measures be taken.

Given that a State criminal trial is still underway, it seems most appropriate to allow that proceeding to unfold prior to initiating a canonical penal process, so that the evidence developed during the State trial may be used.

I request therefore the grant of an exception to the prescription of all offenses against canon 1395 that may be determined to have occurred. I further request authorization to employ at an appropriate later time the procedures of canon 1720 with a view to imposing dismissal from the clerical state.

409560

If you believe that a different course of action is more appropriate, I welcome your advice on the matter. Entrusting this matter to your discretion and awaiting your instruction on how to proceed, I remain

Fraternally yours in Christ,

+ *Roger Cardinal Mahony*

His Eminence
Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
Archbishop of Los Angeles

DIOCESE	Los Angeles in California
NAME OF ORDINARY	Cardinal Roger M. Mahony
CDF PROT. N. (if available)	
NAME OF CLERIC	Reverend Michael E. Wempe

PERSONAL DETAILS OF THE CLERIC	Date of Birth	1 November 1939	Age	65
	Ordination	30 April 1966	Years of ministry	36
ORIGINAL DIOCESE OF INCARDINATION		Los Angeles in California		
MINISTRY IN/TRANSFER TO OTHER DIOCESE		REDACTED		
CONTACT ADDRESS OF THE CLERIC				
PROCURATOR (include original signed mandate)				
CONTACT ADDRESS OF THE PROCURATOR				
ASSIGNMENTS				
Year	Parish	Location	Appointment	
1966	St. John Chrysostom	Inglewood, California	Parochial Vicar	
1969	St. Andrew	Pasadena, California	Parochial Vicar	
1969	St. Rose of Lima	Simi Valley, California	Parochial Vicar	
1973	St. Jude	Westlake Village, California	Parochial Vicar	
1977	Sacred Heart	Ventura (Saticoy), California	Parochial Vicar	
1978	Paraclete High School	Palmdale, California	Faculty	
1978	St. Mary	Palmdale, California	Residence	
1984	St. Sebastian	Santa Paula, California	Parochial Vicar	
1986			Sabbatical	
1987	St. Sebastian	Santa Paula, California	Administrator	
1987			Sick Leave	
1988-2002	Cedars-Sinai Hospital	Los Angeles, California	Chaplain	
1988	St. Ambrose	West Hollywood, California	Residence	
2001	Cathedral Chapel	Los Angeles, California	Residence	

409562

2002	Private residence	Seal Beach, California	Early retirement without faculties.	
ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE CLERIC				
Year	Victim	Age	Imputable Acts	Denunciation
1991-1995	REDACTED	11-15	Placed boy on his lap and fondled genitals both over and under clothing; oral copulation; five occasions over a four year period.	2003
1977-1983		7-14	Massaging the boy's crotch during motorcycle rides; put hand inside shorts and manipulate the genitals; grabbing of buttocks; kissing; exposing himself to the boy; touching the boy with his penis. On one occasion, while helping the boy learn to drive, the priest put his hands inside the boy's pants and caused an accident, on passenger nearly died and the priest suffered severe internal injuries. Hundreds of incidents of abuse.	2003
1975-1978		12-15	Fondling of genitals while motorcycle riding; patting buttocks; fondling genitals underneath the boy's clothing; exposing himself to the boy;	2003
1974		15-16	Exposed himself to the complainant; fondled the boy's genitals; one occasion.	2003
1984-1987			Unspecified claim of molestation	2002
1984-1987			Unspecified claim of molestation	2002
1977-1981		11-15	Skin to skin fondling, approximately 150 occasions of abuse.	2003
1979		12-15	Arranged for the boy to sleep with him and put his hands under the pajamas and fondled the boy's genitals; aggressive pursuit of fondling; one incident of oral sex. Approximately 40-50 incidents of abusive activities over a two and a half year period.	2003
1979-1982		10-13	On camping and a skiing trip and on the motorcycle, unspecified abusive actions.	2003
1969-1977		?	Unspecified molestation	February 1988
1974-1977		13-15	During sleep-overs placing hand under pajamas; fondling penis and masturbating the boy to ejaculation.	February 1988
1980-1983		14-16	Fondling during motorcycle rides; fondling legs and buttocks; oral sex; mutual masturbation; one incident of anal rape. Over 50 incidents of various types of abuse.	2003
1976-1978		14-16	Fondling of genitals; grabbing penis while wrestling; oral copulation; masturbation; other sexual acts	March 2002

CIVIL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CLERIC			
Year	Type/Case	Conviction	Sentence (include copies of civil documents)
2002	Grand Jury/Trial Subpoenas	pending	
2003	Arrest; charged with 3 counts of improper touching and 1 count of oral copulation; preliminary stages of the trial have begun, but no trial date yet set.	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (02CC05471), REDACTED REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (SC036536), REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC308555), REDACTED	pending	
2003	Civil lawsuit for damages (BC308665), REDACTED	pending	
MEASURES ADOPTED BY THE DIOCESE			
Year			
1987	Intervention, Treatment at Servants of the Paraclete, Jemez Springs, New Mexico		
1988	Restoration to limited ministry		
2002	Retirement without faculties		
SUSTENANCE PROVIDED BY THE DIOCESE TO THE CLERIC			
<p>When placed on leave of absence in 2002, Father Wempe was provided with a monthly payment as well as with transportation.</p> <p>As of November 1, 2004 when he turned sixty-five years of age, his sustenance is provided through the Priests' Pension Fund of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.</p> <p>In accord with Archdiocesan policy, loans were extended to him during the period of the initial criminal investigation.</p>			
RESPONSE/RECOURSE MADE BY THE CLERIC			
Year			

BISHOP'S VOTUM

We request authorization of a canon 1720 procedure with the prospect that, if found guilty, the penalty of dismissal from the clerical state be imposed. We request dispensation from prescription, in order to assure that all of the charges against him can be tried in ecclesiastical court, even though some were denounced prior to the promulgation of *Sacramentorum sanctitatis tutela*.

Given that there is a criminal trial underway, it is most appropriate to allow that proceeding to unfold prior to beginning the ecclesiastical trial, so that evidence developed during the State trial can be used in any ecclesiastical process.

Baptismal Certificate



SAINT PATRICK'S CHURCH
ESTHERVILLE, IOWA

OFFICIAL COPY

THIS IS TO CERTIFY:

that Edwin Michael Wempe
Child of REDACTED

and

born in Estherville Iowa

on the 12 day of November

A. D. 1939 and was baptised in this Church on the 26th

day of November A. D. 1939

According to the Rite of the Roman Catholic Church

By Rev. REDACTED

the sponsors

and

As appears from the Baptismal Register of this Church.

This certificate issued by

Rev. REDACTED

Pastor

11th day of May A. D. 1952

Confirmed in Sacred Heart Church Estherville Iowa
October 25th 1948

(*unofficial translation*)

CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH
(Dismissal from the clerical state and dispensation from clerical obligations)

Prot. No. 659/2004

Archdiocese of Los Angeles in California
(Los Angeles, USA)

Mr. Michael Edwin WEMPE

On the 30th day of June in the year 2006

the Supreme Pontiff Pope Benedict XVI,

after hearing the report of the Eminent and Reverend Prefect of this Congregation concerning the serious reasons for taking action in regard to the above-mentioned priest with ministerial faculties in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles in California (Los Angeles, USA), and the necessary preliminary details having been tended to, by supreme decision which allows of no appeal or recourse,

has decreed

that the penalty of dismissal from the clerical state is to be imposed upon said priest.

To this same priest he also grants a dispensation from every obligation connected with Holy Orders according to the following indications.

1. The dismissal and dispensation take effect from the very moment of the Roman Pontiff's decision.
2. The Decree of dismissal and dispensation is to be notified to the priest by a competent local Ordinary; these two elements of the Decree can never be licitly separated. Moreover, said Decree also includes the absolution from censures, insofar as this may be necessary.
3. Notice of this dismissal and dispensation is to be recorded in the parish baptismal registry of aforesaid priest.
4. With regard to the celebration of a canonical marriage, if such should come to pass, the norms established in the Code of Canon Law are to be observed. However, the Ordinary is to see to it that the celebration takes place with due precaution and without outward ostentation.
5. The ecclesiastical authority whose responsibility it is to notify said priest of this Decree is to exhort the priest earnestly to participate in the life of the People of God in a manner that is in keeping with his new situation of life, to be an edifying example and, in this way, to show himself to be an upright son of the Church. At the same time, however, those things that follow are to be made known to him:

- a) *The dismissed priest, by the very fact of his dismissal, loses the rights proper to the clerical state and he loses as well all ecclesiastical dignities and offices; nor is he bound any longer by the other obligations connected with the clerical state;*
- b) *he remains excluded from the exercise of the sacred ministry, with the exceptions mentioned in canons 976 and 986 §2 of the Code of Canon Law, wherefore he cannot give a homily, nor is he permitted to take on a directorial role in any administrative office dealing with pastoral matters or to perform the duties of parish administrator;*
- c) *likewise he cannot perform any functions in Seminaries or equivalent Institutions; in other institutions of higher studies that depend in any way upon ecclesiastical authority he cannot discharge any administrative function or teaching office;*
- d) *in institutions of higher studies that do not depend upon ecclesiastical authority he cannot teach any theological discipline;*
- e) *in institutions of elementary or secondary studies that depend upon ecclesiastical authority he cannot discharge any administrative function or teaching office; in institutions of elementary or secondary studies that do not depend upon ecclesiastical authority the dismissed and dispensed priest is bound by the same prescriptions against teaching religion.*

6. Insofar as possible, the Ordinary shall see to it that the new condition of the dismissed priest will not be a source of scandal for the faithful. Nonetheless, if there is any danger of minors being abused, the Ordinary may make known both the fact of the dismissal and the canonical reasons for it.

7. Notification of this dismissal and dispensation may be made either personally through a notary or ecclesiastical registrar, or by registered mail. The dismissed priest must return one copy properly signed in attestation of having received and accepted the dismissal, dispensation and precepts; but even should he fail to do so, the effects of the Decree remain intact.

8. In a timely manner, the competent Ordinary shall make a brief report to the Congregation concerning the notification that has been made, and should there be any astonishment on the part of the faithful, he shall provide them with a careful explanation.

Anything whatsoever to the contrary notwithstanding.

From the Offices of the Congregation, on the 30th day of June in the year 2006

(signature)
Cardinal William Levada
Prefect

(signature)
Angelo Amato, SDB
Titular Archbishop of Sila
Secretary

Date of notification: _____

Signature of priest signifying his acceptance

Signature of Ordinary

REPORT

Results of the Preliminary Investigation into the *Graviora Delicta* Allegedly Committed by the Reverend Michael Edwin Wempe

SPECIES FACTI

The Reverend Michael Edwin Wempe was born on 1 November 1939 and was ordained a priest for service in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles on 30 April 1966. From the date of his ordination until his early retirement in 2002, Father Wempe was assigned as Parochial Vicar to seven different parishes (1966-1978, 1984-1986), as a faculty member of a Catholic high school (1978-1984), as parish administrator (1987) and as a hospital chaplain (1988-2002). During this same time, he was also granted sabbatical leave in 1986 and sick leave in 1987.

Difficulties with superiors and staff members, excessive emotional outbursts and a series of improper and imprudent relationships with minor boys gave rise to a long history of conflict in Father Wempe's first parish assignments, culminating in Father Wempe's being sent in 1987 to a facility specializing in psychological evaluation and diagnosis. The initial testing concluded that there was a net separation in Father Wempe between his actual behavior and his analysis of this behavior, and that he completely ignored the sexual aspects to his behavior. Father Wempe then participated in a six-month in-patient therapy program, at the end of which continuing individual therapy was strongly recommended as well as participation in a priest support group. It was also recommended that in any future ministry Father Wempe avoid all contact with minors and be helped to stay away from situations in which he might form manipulative relationships with relatively vulnerable individuals.

In 1988, two brothers, in their twenties, claimed that Father Wempe had sexually abused them some fourteen earlier; one of these young men reported that the abuse occurred over a two-year period for a total of about ten incidents. In 2002, a 40-year-old man reported that Father Wempe had sexually abused him 26 years earlier, with multiple acts of abuse being perpetrated against him over a two-year period. In that same year, 2002, the Archdiocese granted Father Wempe early retirement for medical reasons; priestly faculties were also withdrawn at this time. In 2002 and 2003, several other men came forward, accusing Father Wempe of sexually abusing them when then they were pre-teenagers and teenagers. Father Wempe was arrested in 2003 and is now facing criminal charges and several civil lawsuits in conjunction with many of these accusations.

IN FACTO

Everything presented here is drawn from documents on file in the archives of the Curia of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, copies of which are attached hereto as numbered Exhibits.

Alleged Victim No. 1: REDACTED born REDACTED, 14-15 years old at time alleged abuse began

In response to 2002 media coverage of priests removed from ministry due to sexual misconduct with minors, REDACTED wrote a letter to Cardinal Roger Mahony reporting that from 1976 to 1978, when REDACTED was 14-16 years old, he had been sexually abused repeatedly by Father Michael Wempe (see Exhibit 1, Letter of 7 March 2002 to Cardinal Mahony).

In a later more complete statement, Mr. REDACTED reported that these episodes of abuse started with monthly rides with Father Wempe on Father's motorcycle. During these rides, Father Wempe would fondle Mr. REDACTED, putting his, Father's, hands between Mr. REDACTED's legs and rubbing around; Father would explain that he "was trying to keep his hands warm". The abuse continued and escalated. In 1978, on a trip to Tijuana, Mexico, Father Wempe would wrestle with Mr. REDACTED and grab his penis; Mr. REDACTED also reported that Father taught him to masturbate during this trip. That same year, 1978, on a 7-10 day trip to visit Mr. REDACTED grandparents, Father Wempe would have Mr. REDACTED sleep in the same bed with him and would masturbate himself and Mr. REDACTED and would engage in oral sex with Mr. REDACTED. Abuse also took place at a cabin, some 6-9 times: Father Wempe would again have Mr. REDACTED sleep with him in the same bed and would masturbate Mr. REDACTED. He would instruct Mr. REDACTED to masturbate him, Father Wempe, and would attempt to engage in anal sex with him. He also performed oral sex on Mr. REDACTED (see Exhibit 2, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 2: REDACTED, born REDACTED, 7-16 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED reported that the abuse began in 1977, when he was 7 years old, on motorcycle rides with Father Wempe, during which Father would fondle REDACTED's genitals. Other activities included sleeping in the same bed, Father attempting to masturbate REDACTED, hugging and kissing him and grabbing his buttocks, exposing himself to REDACTED touching REDACTED with his, Father Wempe's, penis. In January 1986, after REDACTED had obtained his learner's permit for driving, Father Wempe was giving him a driving lesson in Father's car with REDACTED driving, also in the car was REDACTED's younger brother REDACTED (Alleged Victim No. 4 below). In the course of this driving "lesson", Father Wempe sat very close to REDACTED with his, Father's, left hand inside REDACTED's pants. On this occasion, REDACTED became distracted and drifted out of his lane into on-coming traffic on a two-lane highway. Father Wempe yanked the steering wheel, attempting to bring the car safely across the lane of on-coming traffic, but the car was broad-sided by a large commercial truck, severely injuring REDACTED's younger brother REDACTED who nearly died as a result of the accident. That was the last time that Father Wempe abused REDACTED (see Exhibit 3, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 3: REDACTED born REDACTED, 12-15 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED is the older brother of Alleged Victim No. 2 above. He reported that the abuse began while he was on day-trips and camping trips with Father Wempe, and that there were a minimum of 50 episodes of abuse. The abuse would also be perpetrated

while he was with Father Wempe on Father's motorcycle, while he was alone with Father in his, REDACTED's, home and at the rectory of St. Jude's Church. Father Wempe would fondle REDACTED genitals and expose himself to REDACTED (see Exhibit 4, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 4: REDACTED born REDACTED 11-15 years old at time of alleged abuse.

REDACTED is the younger brother of Alleged Victims Nos. 2 and 3 above. He reported that the abuse occurred only on five occasions when he was alone with Father Wempe for half-day periods. Activities included Father Wempe fondling REDACTED's genitals, attempting to masturbate REDACTED and performing oral sex on him (see Exhibit 5, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 5: REDACTED, born REDACTED, 12-15 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED reported a history of abuse by Father Wempe over a period of 2-2½ years, while Father was in residence at St. Mary's Church in Palmdale, for a total of 4-50 episodes. Abusive acts included fondling of genitals while riding with Father Wempe on Father's motorcycle, while in Father's car and at the rectory. Father Wempe and REDACTED would also sleep together in the same bed and there was one episode of Father Wempe performing oral sex on REDACTED (see Exhibit 6, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 6: REDACTED born REDACTED 11-15 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED is the older brother of Alleged Victim No. 5 above. He reported that he was abused by Father Wempe approximately 150 times while Father was in residence at St. Mary's Church in Palmdale. Abusive acts included skin-to-skin fondling on camping trips, in the car, when REDACTED spent the night with Father Wempe at rectory and in the house of Father Wempe's mother in Seal Beach (see Exhibit 7, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 7: REDACTED, born REDACTED 10-13 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED is the younger brother of Alleged Victims Nos. 5 and 6 above. Without specifying what was involved in the abusive acts, he reported that he was abused by Father Wempe "countless times over a [period of] three to four years". He added that "my brothers REDACTED stayed with Father Mike during the same times I did" see Exhibit 8, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED.

Alleged Victim No. 8: REDACTED, born REDACTED 13-14 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED reported that from 1974 to 1975 he was sexually abused a total of about ten times by Father Wempe. These episodes of abuse took place on Father Wempe's motorcycle, in Father's camper and at the rectory of St. Jude's Church; they included

Father Wempe fondling REDACTED's genitals and masturbating REDACTED while restraining him. REDACTED also claimed that his brother REDACTED was also sexually abused by Father Wempe (see Exhibit 9, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 9: REDACTED, date of birth unknown, a young teenager at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED is the brother of Alleged Victim No. 8 above and has provided no statement explicit concerning his being sexually abused by Father Wempe. However, his brother REDACTED claims that REDACTED was abused by Father Wempe, and both brothers met with REDACTED Los Angeles and REDACTED Santa Barbara Region of the Archdiocese, to share their experiences of abuse with REDACTED (see Exhibit 10, Memo of 14 March 1988). Of this meeting, REDACTED wrote that "REDACTED also spoke of his experiences, similar to REDACTED, and REDACTED himself, in a letter to REDACTED stated that "numerous, diverse thoughts have gone through my head ... most profound, painful, and obvious of them is the thought/feeling that came to me as REDACTED began to explain the whole situation ... That is, that this silence over years and years, due to selfishness and the will to survive, served only to protect this man in the ugly things he was doing. I only wish now that I'd've passed this info along to you (or whomever) long ago, so that more could have been done sooner. Somehow I felt, I guess, that my information would affect [sic] no change, that I was powerless" (see Exhibit 11, REDACTED's Letter and REDACTED's Letter of February 1988).

Alleged Victim No. 10: REDACTED, born REDACTED 14-16 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED reported that he was abused more than 50 times by Father Wempe while Father was teacher at Paraclete High School in Palmdale and in residence at St. Mary's. The abuse included fondling and caressing, the viewing of pornographic material, REDACTED's being masturbated twice by Father Wempe twice, being asked twice to masturbate Father Wempe, being asked twice to perform oral sex on Father Wempe, having oral sex performed once on him by Father Wempe and being raped once by Father Wempe (see Exhibit 12, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

Alleged Victim No. 11: REDACTED born REDACTED age at time of abuse unknown

REDACTED reported that in 1985, 1986 or 1987, while Father Wempe was at St. Sebastian Church in Santa Paula, Father touched REDACTED's naked body, fondled his genitals and performed oral sex on him. REDACTED further alleged that Father Wempe had done similar things to REDACTED's older brother REDACTED (see Exhibit 13, Archdiocese Child Abuse and Neglect Non-Mandatory Reporting Form of 27 June 2005).

Alleged Victim No. 12: REDACTED date of birth unknown, age at time of alleged abuse unknown

REDACTED is the older brother of Alleged Victim No. 11 above and has not come forward himself to make any claims of sexual abuse against him by Father Wempe. However, his brother alleged that REDACTED also was a victim of Father Wempe's abuse (see

Exhibit 13, Archdiocese Child Abuse and Neglect Non-Mandatory Reporting Form of 27 June 2005).

Alleged Victim No. 13: REDACTED born REDACTED 15-16 years old at time of alleged abuse

REDACTED claimed that he was abused by Father Wempe while Father was at St. Jude's in Westlake Village; Father Wempe was a priest, family friend and advisor. The abuse took place at the sauna and swimming pool areas of the Oakview Apartments in Westlake Village, and included Father Wempe exposing himself to REDACTED suggesting that REDACTED do the same, and fondling REDACTED genitals (see Exhibit 14, Claimant Questionnaire of REDACTED).

A Brief Background of Facts

From the time of his first assignments in the Archdiocese, Father Wempe has had a series of difficulties and problems, particularly with superiors, such that recommendations were made that he receive professional help (see Exhibit 15, Letter of 13 December 1977 to Cardinal Manning and Memo of 2 February 1978 to the Cardinal). In 1987, the REDACTED at St. Sebastian Church in Santa Paula wrote to the Vicar for Clergy with serious concerns about Father Wempe's relationships with young boys at the parish (see Exhibit 16, Letter of 22 May 1987 to Msgr. Curry). In light of these problems with authority and of possible sexual misconduct with minors, Father Wempe was sent to a diagnostic facility in New Mexico for complete psychological evaluation and treatment (see Exhibit 17, Letter of Msgr. Curry of 17 June 1987).

The psychological portion of this evaluation and testing came to the conclusion that Father Wempe "has completely ignored the sexual aspects to his behavior and has minimized to a great extent the sexual needs that he has had. He is going to need to deal both with his needs for intimacy and his sexuality ... He has some major rationalizations to undo and some very real depression that he has not faced ... He is going to need to both accept the consequences of his behavior for his own life and the fact that although he was telling himself that he had nothing but positive motives in his relationships with these boys, that some of his behavior may in fact have caused some very real harm ... His issues with authority problems, although clearly a major problem for him, seem secondary at this point to his sexual behavior" (see Exhibit 18, Report of Psychological Evaluation and Testing of 24 June 1987). The psychiatric report noted that Father Wempe "resisted the idea of being homosexual" although he recalled "genital sex play with other boys". This same report also observed that Father Wempe "has sexual fantasies of making boys feel good. He doesn't think the kids he's slept with on vacations would consider their closeness molesting" (see Exhibit 18, Psychiatric Evaluation of 24 June 1987).

Following this evaluation and testing, Father Wempe remained in the New Mexico facility for a six-month program of in-house therapy and treatment. At the conclusion of this program, it was noted that "individual therapy is clearly called for" and the recommendation was made that that in considerations of future ministry, Father Wempe "needs to be in a situation which will allow him to avoid all contact with minors and also help him stay away from the opportunity for forming manipulative relationships

with people who are relatively vulnerable" (see Exhibit 19, Letter of 23 December 1987 to Cardinal Mahony).

In response to the accusation of sexual abuse brought against Father Wempe in 1988, referring to events that had taken place more than ten years earlier, the alleged victim was informed that the Archdiocese would pay for counseling if the victim so desired (see Exhibit 10, Memo of 14 March 1988). The victim took advantage of this offer, and the Vicar for Clergy asked Father Wempe to reimburse the Archdiocese the amount paid out for therapy for this individual, as it is archdiocesan policy that it is the responsibility of the priest involved to assist the injured party (see Exhibit 20, Letter of 6 January 1989 to Father Wempe). Father Wempe responded by sending a check for \$490 to cover the costs involved (see Exhibit 21, Letter of 17 February 1989 to Father Wempe).

Statements of Fr. Wempe regarding accusations

In the Personal History Sheet compiled by Fr. Wempe for his Treatment Program at Foundation House in New Mexico (see Exhibit 22, Personal History Sheet of Fr. Wempe, dated 19 June 1987), Fr. Wempe stated: "there was also a young boy whom I took camping and we did sleep together. There was no sex, but I am sure that I cuddled with him ... During my life there have been kids that I wanted to 'father' and protect. I feel that they are a return to my very young childhood ... that I could find 'somebody to go to my room and sleep with me' both physically and psychologically. I have never had or allowed these boys to do anything to me sexually. We have slept together, not been afraid that we might accidentally touch each other, we have been at ease" (p. 6 of Exhibit 22).

He went on to say: "I seem to rush to the aid of the young boys I see whom I feel, or who really are, being let down by their fathers (some fathers dead and some alive). I want to share with them and teach them how to shoot a gun, how to ride a motorcycle, how to repair a car, how to cry, how to hug, how to be held and loved. I have been close to them but I firmly believe that I HAVE NEVER HURT THEM ... [I had] the need to be held and to hold that seemed to be fulfilled only by young boys ... [A major person in my life was] ^{REDACTED} the young man that lived with me for a period of time. There was no sex whatsoever, but I deeply loved him and he deeply loved me. We did sleep together until he felt he was too old. We always hugged and were never afraid to touch each other (non-sexually)" (p. 7 of Exhibit 22). *made towards the end of the treatment he was*

undergo,
Fr. W.
wrote:
In a further statement, ~~describing his understanding of his placement in the above-mentioned Treatment Program~~, Fr. Wempe wrote: "I needed intimacy and tried to use others, including the boys, to fulfill that need. I told myself that I was standing in for the boys' fathers who were either absent or non-effective. I am now aware that I was manipulating the boys for my own needs which manifested themselves sexually" (see Exhibit 23, Placement Statement by Fr. Wempe).

Furthermore, while undergoing treatment in the above-mentioned program, Fr. Wempe participated in regular sessions of psychological counseling. In his initial interview, it was noted that Fr. Wempe had "totally finessed his way through seven years of therapy ... He lied to the psychologist. [He has] been involved with minors - presently with a 12-year-old - [acting as a] surrogate father but also [as a] sex partner"; this behavior was perceived as "very serious" (see Exhibit 24, Notes of 25 June 1987).

Periodic reports were sent to Cardinal Mahony regarding Fr. Wempe's progress in the above-mentioned Treatment Program. In the first of these reports (see Exhibit 25, Report of 17 August 1987), Dr. REDACTED Ph.D., Fr. Wempe's treatment psychologist, noted: "[Fr. Wempe] was still doing considerable rationalizing and attributing a larger percentage of his behavior to wanting to help children ... I pushed relatively hard for him to see that although much of his behavior may have been motivated by a desire to help other people, certainly a large portion of his behavior also needed to be viewed in terms of satisfying his own sexual needs. He reports that he does not become sexually stimulated, however, his masturbation fantasies revolve primarily around these experiences. Clearly, this is a sexual incident for him ... He talked about the fact that for him masturbating when he wakes up in the morning is a very comforting thing and helps him get back to sleep and makes him feel as if he is being cuddled back to sleep. He reports that this is what he wants to give to the children" (pp. 2 and 3 of Exhibit 25).

In the second report (see Exhibit 26, Report of 25 September 1987), Dr. REDACTED observed: "We talked about ... the boy he was close to and what needs to be done about that. We talked about the fact that it is not a matter of his having to absolutely cut off contact immediately but that he needs some way to pull back from that relationship. At one point, it became clear to him that in some ways this is going to be considerably harder for him than it was going to be for the boy, that he was more needy of the relationship than the boy was, and that in fact, he needed the boy more than the boy needed him" (p. 2 of Exhibit 26). Dr. REDACTED reported further that "one of the more telling points was the statement he made about one boy that he did a lot of things together with. What he said was that he loved that boy too much to ever do anything sexual with him. There seemed to be some relationship in strength of the attachment that he felt toward a boy and his unwillingness to become sexually involved with that boy" (p. 6 of Exhibit 26).

In the third report (see Exhibit 27, Report of 30 October 1987), Dr. REDACTED noted: "We talked about rationalization and how he has rationalized the hurt that he has done to kids. He initially took the stance that he could not see how he had hurt kids and my stance with him was essentially that everyone knows that one does not do sexual things with kids and that if he would show a video tape to anyone about what he did that they would identify it as sexual and they would identify that as wrong. It is my contention that lying within Michael somewhere there is this knowledge that what he did was wrong. That it is a denial of that reality that he has been involved in for a long time" (p. 3 of Exhibit 27).

While Fr. Wempe was in the above-mentioned Treatment Program, he was visited by REDACTED Vicar for Clergy, who reported afterwards to Cardinal Mahony that "we discussed the possibility of legal problems in the future. [Fr. Wempe] is very aware that what he did comes within the scope of the criminal law in California. Although I do not know the exact details, he told me that there was some sexual touching, although most of his activity would better be described as 'cuddling'. He also mentioned that with the exception of one boy, all the others involved are now over twenty-one (see Exhibit 28, Memo of 22 November 1987).

In the final report (see Exhibit 29, Report of 23 December 1987), Dr. REDACTED implicitly observed that Fr. Wempe had caused sexual harm to individuals in the past: "I

think that the potential for his harming people in a sexual fashion is much, much less than it was before" (p. 2 of Exhibit 29).

Moreover, in an initial spiritual evaluation made at the beginning of Fr. Wempe's treatment program, it was noted that "[Fr. Wempe] is aware of the areas of authority and of homosexuality and of possible child abuse which are looming very large in his consciousness right now" (see Exhibit 30, Spiritual Evaluation of 24 June 1987).

CONCLUSION

From the evidence brought forth in the preliminary investigation it appears virtually certain that delicts, as described in canon 2359 §2 of the 1917 *CIC* and maintained in canon 1395 §2 of the 1983 *CIC*, have been committed.



MEMORANDUM
OFFICE OF THE VICAR FOR CLERGY

TO: REDACTED
FROM: REDACTED
RE: *Father Michael Wempe*
DATE: March 29, 2002

On February 15, 2002, Father Michael Wempe was granted early retirement due to medical reasons. He is sixty-two years old. He was born on November 1, 1939.

His medical insurance will be covered by the transition assistance offered by Cedar-Sinai with RETA as his secondary coverage. Additional reimbursement for medical costs in accord with the standard clergy policies of the Archdiocese will be requested through this office.

The Archdiocese is providing him with an automobile. As with all retired priests, he will be included under the Archdiocesan auto insurance program. He has been asked to register the car properly. He may be calling you to obtain the proper guidance to assure this.

Thank you very much for taking note of this information.

409577



FILE OUT

MEMORANDUM
OFFICE OF THE VICAR FOR CLERGY

TO: REDACTED

FROM:

RE: *Reverend Michael E. Wempe*

DATE: March 11, 2002

Father Michael Wempe has moved. His new address and telephone number are as follows: REDACTED

Thank you for taking note of this information.

409578

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2005 B3

Ex-Priest Admits Old Sex Charges

Lawyer reveals molestation of 13 boys beyond statute of limitations in attempt to curb testimony in current case.

By JEAN GUCCIONE
Times Staff Writer

The attorney for a former Los Angeles priest admitted Friday that his client had molested 13 boys in the 1970s and 1980s, an unusual public acknowledgment of guilt in the hundreds of sexual abuse cases against the Los Angeles Archdiocese.

Michael Edwin Wempe's lawyer made the admission during a hearing in a criminal case accusing the former priest of molesting another boy in the 1990s when he was chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center.

The lawyer did so for strategic reasons in an attempt to limit damaging testimony about old abuse cases while he continues to fight the current charges. Wempe's case is being watched closely because he is one of three priests accused of molesting children after Cardinal Roger M. Mahony, responding to abuse complaints, sent him to therapy and returned him to ministry.

The archdiocese has been sued by more than 560 people for allegedly failing to protect children from abuse, but the cases have long been mired in settlement talks and only a handful of the allegations have been tested in court.

The Wempe case has a tangled history: The former priest was originally charged with 42 counts stemming from decades-old molestations, one of which involved two brothers. But the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2003 that the California law allowing prosecution of old child abuse cases violated the statute of limitations, and the charges were dismissed.

The two boys' younger brother came forward and said Wempe had molested him in the 1990s, within the statutory time limit. The Times generally does not identify victims of alleged sexual abuse.

The defense contends that the younger brother fabricated his accusation to avenge his older brothers. On Friday, defense attorneys Leonard B. Levine and Donald H. Steier asked the court to limit testimony about Wempe's past molestation of the older brothers.

Noting that the current victim is the only one to come forward after 1987, when Wempe returned from therapy, they argued that an inundation of testimony about the priest's abuse history could unfairly bias jurors.

Jurors probably "will say to themselves, 'We don't care. We are going to find him guilty for what he did 20 years ago,'" Levine told the court.

Deputy Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks said he wanted to put on all 13 of Wempe's earlier victims to show that the priest was "a master" at child molestation by the time he met the younger brother.

Judge Curtis Rappe said he would allow the defense addi-

tional witnesses, but hadn't decided how many. Without the background, Rappe said, it "would give a false impression that it was just a little family conspiracy."

Wempe is accused of fondling and masturbating the younger brother during driving lessons and in a parked car. Defense lawyers have said there is no independent evidence of the brother's story. In court papers, they contended that Wempe, who denies the abuse, passed two polygraph tests.

Prosecutors "are trying to convict someone for something he didn't do based on something he did do 20 or 30 years ago," Levine said. "That is not the way the system works."

Lee Bashforth, one of Wempe's earlier victims, said the former priest should not get away with admitting past molestations without suffering consequences. Bashforth recalled watching video of the smiling priest leaving Los Angeles County Jail after the earlier case was dismissed, and his lawyer's statement that Wempe's only regret was he didn't get the chance to clear his name.

"They are obviously saying this now because the truth cannot really harm them," he said.

Vicar for Clergy Database

Clergy Assignment Record

Mr Michael E. Wempe
 REDACTED

<i>Current Primary Assignment</i>		<i>Age</i>	69
<i>Birth Date</i>	11/1/1939	<i>Deanery</i>	0
<i>Birth City</i>	Estherville, Iowa, USA		
<i>Diaconate Ordination</i>			
<i>Priesthood Ordination</i>	4/30/1966		
<i>Diocese Name</i>	Archdiocese of Los Angeles		
<i>Date of Incardination</i>	5/1/1963		
<i>Religious Community</i>			
<i>Ritual Ascription</i>	Latin		
<i>Ministry Status</i>	Dismissed from Clerical State		
<i>Seminary</i>	St. John's Seminary, Camarillo		
<i>Ethnicity</i>	American (USA)		

<u><i>Language(s)</i></u>	<u><i>Fluency</i></u>
Spanish	Conversational Basics

Fingerprint Verification and Safeguard Training

Date Background Check
Safeguard Training

Assignment History

<i>Assignment</i>	<i>Beginning Date</i>	<i>Completion Date</i>
Dismissed from Clerical State, Rescript from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Prot. No. 659/2004-23647.	6/30/2006	
Retired with No Faculties, NO FACULTIES. OUT OF PRIESTLY MINISTRY	2/15/2002	6/29/2006
Cathedral Chapel, Los Angeles Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	2/1/2002	2/14/2002
Immaculate Heart of Mary Catholic Church, Los Angeles Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	10/15/1998	1/31/2001
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles Chaplain, Active Service	1/18/1988	2/14/2002
St. Ambrose Catholic Church, West Hollywood Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	1/18/1988	10/14/1998
Sick Leave	7/1/1987	1/17/1988

St. Sebastian Catholic Church, Santa Paula Administrator Pro Tem, Active Service	2/1/1987	6/30/1987
Vatican II Institute, Rome, Sabbatical	9/1/1986	12/1/1986
St. Sebastian Catholic Church, Santa Paula Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	7/9/1984	1/31/1987
St. Mary Catholic Church, Palmdale Resident, Resident	2/20/1978	7/8/1984
Paradete High School, Lancaster Education-Teacher/Faculty, Active Service	2/20/1978	7/8/1984
Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Ventura Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	6/17/1977	2/19/1978
St. Jude Catholic Church, Westlake Village Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	6/11/1973	6/16/1977
St. Rose of Lima Catholic Church, Simi Valley Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	9/2/1969	6/10/1973
St. Andrew Catholic Church, Pasadena Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	3/25/1969	9/1/1969
St. John Chrysostom Catholic Church, Inglewood Associate Pastor (Parochial Vicar), Active Service	5/14/1966	3/24/1969

Cox, Msgr. Craig A.

From:

REDACTED

Sent:

Wednesday, February 22, 2006 12:23 PM

To:

Cardinal Mahony; REDACTED

Cox, Msgr. Craig A.;

REDACTED

Subject:

Press release on Wempe

Sent to media

REDACTED

FOR: IMMEDIATE RELEASE
FEBRUARY 22, 2006

**STATEMENT OF ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
ON CONVICTION OF FATHER MICHAEL WEMPE**

Father Michael Wempe's conviction cannot restore the trust and innocence stolen from his victims, but hopefully this verdict may provide them some measure of justice and comfort.

To those he abused, we again apologize, and we assure them of our support and of our firm resolve to continue to employ effective means of preventing all forms of abuse in our church.

We believed Father Wempe's treatment had been successful. Today, a priest credibly accused of abuse is permanently removed from ministry. At the same time, abuse prevention programs in all of our parishes and schools equip parents and guardians with the skills to spot behavior that can lead to abuse and to report such behavior before abuse can take place.

REDACTED

REDACTED

INTERNAL REPORT - CONFIDENTIAL

(6) 4/5/05 Archdiocese of Los Angeles
 Assistance Ministry Department
 Report date: 6/27/2005 (A) Revised From: Sr. REDACTED

Alleged perpetrator: Wempe
 REDACTED

Alleged victim:

Date of incident: 1985-'86 or 87

Brief Description:

Type of Report:

☒ Mandatory ☒ Non-Mandatory ☐ Anonymous reporter
☐ Third-party reporting ☐ Incomplete information ☐ Attached information

Report sent to:

☒ REDACTED - Clergy Misconduct Oversight Board
 (Priests, Deacons, Brothers)

☐ Sr. REDACTED for Women Religious
 (All women religious)

☐ Mr. REDACTED Superintendent Secondary Schools
 (Secondary Schools)

☒ Msgr. Craig Cox, Vicar for Clergy
 (Priests, Deacons, Brothers)

☒ REDACTED
 (All reports)

☐ Mr. REDACTED - Human Resources
 (Schools, ACC, Cemetery employees)

☐ Mrs. REDACTED Superintendent Elementary Schools
 (Elementary Schools)

☐ Sr. REDACTED Assistance Ministry
 (All reports)

☐ Sr. REDACTED - Religious Education
 (CCD and RCIA)

See
 attached
 history
Revised

**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM**

Date of this report to Public Authority: **July 5, 2005 – victim report**
Name of Public Authority: Det. Barraclough - 213-485-2883 –
Parent report 4/21/02
Date of this Report to Archdiocese: **Victim reported June 27, 2005**
Reported to Archdiocese by: REDACTED (victim)
Complainant Name: "
Current Address: REDACTED
Telephone:
Date of Birth:
Alleged Perpetrator: Fr. Michael Wempe
Name: (Victim) REDACTED (6 years old)
Name of Possible Witness: Brother, REDACTED
Reported Date of Incident: (s) "1985 or 86 or 87" at St. Sebastian Church
in Santa Paula
Reported Circumstances of Incident(s): REDACTED said. "There was one incident of
molestation. He (Wempe) was touching my
naked body. There was touching of genitals
& oral sex. He did things to my brother who
was older. He was an altar boy. My father
died and some friends introduced us to Fr.
Wempe."
Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect: Sexual abuse.
Comments: Mrs. REDACTED 's Mother) called
4/21/02. She said that she thought her sons
had been molested by Wempe. We asked
her to have them call us. 4/28/05 Mother
called again. Requested sons to call.
6/27/05 REDACTED called for the first time to
report his abuse. He was asked to have his
brother call us.
Submitted by the Archdiocese of Los
Angeles:
REDACTED

SUSPECTED CHILD ABUSE REPORT

To be Completed by Reporting Party

A. Case Identification

To be completed by Investigating CPA

Victim Name: REDACTED / *Wernpe*
 Report No./Case Name: _____
 Date of Report: _____

B. Victim

NAME/TITLE REDACTED

Complainant

ADDRESS REDACTED REDACTED REDACTED

(Work)

PHONE REDACTED	DATE OF REPORT <i>4-21-02</i>	BIRTHDATE	SEX	RACE
-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------	-----	------

C. Call

X REDACTED

OFFICIAL CONTACTED Detective Brown *Barrackclough* PHONE (213) 485-2883 ✓ DATE/TIME *4/21/02*

D. Other Parties

NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)	ADDRESS
----------------------------	---------

PRESENT LOCATION OF
REDACTED

REDACTED

NAME OF CHURCH OR SCHOOL REDACTED

ADDRESS AT TIME OF INCIDENT

DATE/TIME OF INCIDENT	PLACE OF INCIDENT	(Check One) Occurred <input type="checkbox"/> Observed <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	-------------------	---

TYPE OF SEXUAL ABUSE: *None* REDACTED

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:

F. Perpetrator Information

Fr. Wernpe - St. Sebastian

Signed _____



**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM**

Date of This Report to Public Authority: N/A

Name of Public Authority: N/A

Date of This Report to Archdiocese: 4/28/05

Reported to Archdiocese by: Mrs. REDACTED

Alleged Victim: her son

Current Address: _____

Telephone: REDACTED

Date of Birth _____

Alleged Perpetrator:

Name Fr. Michael Wempe

Names of Possible Witnesses: _____

Reported Date of Incident: _____

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s): Fr. Wempe was the pastor at their Parish

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect: Sexual

Comments: Mother reports that her son, now 25 years old has always been a very angry person and has been in trouble on occasion. He has had some counseling and the therapists have always asked if had ever been sexually molested, ^{something} he did not admit at the time. Now her son says he is remembering several incidents. Mrs. ^{REDACTED} related some of her personal circumstances and has now decided that the best thing to do is to let her son call us directly. She will ask him to do that. I asked Mrs. ^{REDACTED} to please follow up with us to make sure her son does call us. We are not to call her at home. Mrs. ^{REDACTED} has another son, now thirty, who has not denied being molested but has emphatically stated he does not want to talk about it. A complete report will be prepared when we have the information from the son. I assured Mrs. ^{REDACTED} that we would provide counseling for her son if he wishes and also asked her if she thought she might benefit from some counseling herself. At this time she said no, but the door was left open in case she changes her mind.

INTERNAL REPORT - CONFIDENTIAL

Archdiocese of Los Angeles
Assistance Ministry Department

Report date:

6/27/2005

From: Sr. REDACTED

Alleged perpetrator:

Alleged victim:

Date of incident:

Brief Description:

Type of Report:

☐ Mandatory ☒ Non-Mandatory ☐ Anonymous reporter
☐ Third-party reporting ☐ Incomplete information ☐ Attached information

Report sent to:

☒ REDACTED - Clergy Misconduct Oversight Board
(Priests, Deacons, Brothers)

☐ REDACTED for Women Religious
(All women religious)

☐ Mrs. REDACTED Superintendent Secondary Schools
(Secondary Schools)

☒ Msgr. Craig Cox, Vicar for Clergy
(Priests, Deacons, Brothers)

☒ REDACTED
(All reports)

☐ Mr. REDACTED - Human Resources
(Schools, ACC, Cemetery employees)

☐ Mrs. REDACTED Superintendent Elementary Schools
(Elementary Schools)

☐ Sr. REDACTED Assistance Ministry
(All reports)

☐ Sr. REDACTED Religious Education
(CCD and RCIA)

**ARCHDIOCESE OF LOS ANGELES
CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
NON-MANDATORY REPORTING FORM**

Date of this report to Public Authority:

Name of Public Authority:

Date of this Report to Archdiocese:

June 27, 2005

Reported to Archdiocese by:

REDACTED

Complainant Name:

Current Address:

Telephone:

Date of Birth:

July 9, 1979

Alleged Perpetrator:

Fr. Michael Wempe

Name: (Victim)

REDACTED - 6 years old

Name of Possible Witness:

Brother (also a victim – more happened to him)

Reported Date of Incident: (s)

“1985 or 86 or 87 at St. Sebastian Church in Santa Paula”

Reported Circumstances of Incident(s):

“There was one incident of molestation. He (Wempe) was touching my naked body. There was touching of genitals & oral sex. He did things to my brother who was older. He was an altar boy. My father had died and some friends introduced us to Fr. Wempe.”
Sexual abuse of a minor under 14 years

Reported Type of Abuse or Neglect:

Comments:

Submitted by the Archdiocese of Los Angeles:

REDACTED

SEPTEMBER 11, 2003 | CRIMINAL

[Print](#) | [Email](#)
[Reprint rights](#)**Police Arrest Freed Priest in New Sex Case**

Police Arrest Freed Priest on Sex Charge

By Jeffrey Anderson and Anne LaJeunesse

Daily Journal Staff Writers

LOS ANGELES - Retired Roman Catholic priest Michael Wempe, who walked out of jail this summer after the U.S. Supreme Court gutted church sex-abuse investigations in California, was arrested Wednesday on new charges of molesting a child while serving as chaplain at Cedars-Sinai Hospital, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department said.

The alleged victim came forward after learning that Wempe had been released because of the Supreme Court ruling, which in June struck down the child-molestation statute that prosecutors were using to go after sexual-abuse crimes that were otherwise time-barred, sheriff's Sgt. Dan Scott, the arresting officer, said.

"He had held it in out of embarrassment, but when he saw that Wempe was going to be released from the previous charges, he decided to come forward," Scott said.

Wempe was arrested without incident at 7 a.m. at his Leisure World home in Seal Beach and booked on suspicion of child molestation, Scott said. He is being held at Los Angeles County Jail in lieu of \$2 million bail.

His alleged victim, a male in his early 20s who has asked to remain anonymous, claims Wempe molested him from 1990 to 1995, beginning when he was 11, Scott said.

The alleged molestations took place in a car and on the premises of Cedars-Sinai Hospital, where Wempe served as a chaplain from 1988 until his forced retirement in 2002.

Cardinal Roger Mahony became aware of molestation claims against Wempe in 1986, a representative of Mahony said. But after a period of treatment and rehabilitation, which also took place at Cedars-Sinai, Wempe was restored by Mahony to the ministry in 1988.

In 2002, Wempe, along with several other Los Angeles priests, was forced to retire as additional claims of sexual abuse began to surface.

"I can't tell you how disappointed I am with Wempe," J. Michael Hennigan, attorney for the Los Angeles Archdiocese, said. "We had believed and hoped that he was rehabilitated.

"We received glowing reports from Cedars about his progress. He wouldn't even go near the pediatric ward there."

"I'm with [the archdiocese] on this," said Donald Steier, whose firm, Guzin & Steier, represents Wempe in both criminal and civil court. "But I have real questions about this. I've interviewed Wempe extensively.

"I'm suspicious of the time period which is being alleged," Steier said. "Wempe was in group therapy and receiving aftercare at the time.

"I'm shocked and surprised."

Wempe is to be arraigned today at the Criminal Courts Building in downtown Los Angeles.

The alleged victim was not a patient at the hospital, according to Hennigan.

"Based on discussions with the district attorney, my understanding is that Wempe is a friend of the family," Hennigan said. "I have an idea of who it is, but I can't be sure."

Wempe was released June 27 from Los Angeles County Jail, the day after the Supreme Court ruling in *Stogner v. California*. He had been charged with 42 counts involving the alleged molestation of five boys between 1976 and 1985. Wempe, who attended seminary at St. John's Seminary in Camarillo, was associate pastor and parochial vicar at St. Jude Church in Westlake Village and Sacred Heart Church in Ventura County from 1973 to 1978, and a resident in active service at St. Mary Church in Palmdale, from 1978 to 1984.

Two brothers, who are among the original five alleged victims, are suing Wempe in Los Angeles civil court.

Following the Supreme Court decision, prosecutors around the state were forced to dismiss pending criminal cases and abandon many investigations.

Los Angeles prosecutors dismissed all 11 of the criminal cases they had filed in the last year. If

Wempe is charged, his case will be the first new filing in Los Angeles since the Supreme Court decision that crippled law enforcers and prosecutors and left victims around the state in despair.

Following Wempe's arrest Wednesday, District Attorney Steve Cooley released a statement.

"The re-arrest of Michael Wempe will restore the faith of victims shattered by the recent Supreme Court decision," Cooley wrote.

On Wednesday, law enforcers in neighboring counties said they were upset over watching accused molesters go free. But they expressed hope that Wempe's re-arrest will spark a revival of their own investigations.

"We are not currently investigating any priests in connection with alleged sex crimes," said Lieutenant Steve Szabo with the Orange County Sheriff's Department sex crimes unit. "We had made several arrests, but due to the Supreme Court decision, we had to let them go."

"It's sickening, because these guys were guilty," said Orange County Deputy District Attorney Rosanne Froeberg, head of the sexual assault unit.

Following the high-court ruling in June, Froeberg's office was forced to dismiss cases against three Catholic priests and one Protestant minister, she said.

One priest, the Rev. Siegfried Widera, who had been charged with sexual molestation of a minor but whose case would have been dismissed, jumped from a building to his death in Mazatlan just before the landmark ruling, Froeberg added.

Prosecutors in Ventura County were forced to dismiss pending cases and abandon their ongoing criminal investigations of numerous others, according to sources in that office.

"We were clubbed to death by that Supreme Court case, and 99 percent of what we were working on has dried up," said one prosecutor, who asked to remain anonymous.

"Getting the focus back on these cases is important," Froeberg said. "Since the Supreme Court decision, it has been pretty quiet, but it's not like priests stopped molesting children."

"We can't predict if, or how many, people might come forward now, but we've asked law enforcers to take down reports on older crimes that can't be prosecuted, because we can obtain corroborating information that helps us resurrect other older cases, or are able to prosecute more recent ones."

Scott added, "We still are actively investigating other cases, including the ones that were dismissed. Something like this could happen where a new victim comes forward."

"We're still out there digging."

© 2003 Daily Journal Corporation. All rights reserved.

CMDB-013-01

MM 7/10/83

Molestation Case Dropped Against Fifth Former Priest in County

(CNS) A judge yesterday dismissed criminal charges against the fifth of 10 former priests charged in Los Angeles County in child molestation cases dating back several decades.

Los Angeles Superior Court Judge David Horowitz granted the motion to dismiss the case against the priest, [REDACTED], in light of a recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling.

The high court held unconstitutional a California law that extended the statute of limitations on sex crimes. Deputy District Attorney Christ Frey said outside court that the prosecution had no choice but to drop the case in light of the ruling.

"It's very disappointing," she said after the brief hearing. "He had confessed twice on tape to these crimes against an altar boy at St. Vincent Church in Los Angeles nearly two decades ago."

Rodriguez's lawyer, Arthur C. Braudrick, said he believed his client was "relieved" about the dismissal. The attorney did not want to comment on the allegations that had been leveled against the former priest.

Rodriguez was at the courthouse but not in the courtroom to hear the judge's announcement, Braudrick said.

Rodriguez was charged last Sept. 26 with eight counts of committing a lewd act on a child under 14. The alleged crimes occurred between September 1984 and September 1986.

Rodriguez conferred with a detective during a police investigation and apologized in a taped conversation to the victim and admitted what he had done, the prosecutor said.

It will be up to authorities in neighboring Ventura and Santa Barbara counties to determine if they can prosecute Rodriguez in other possible cases, Frey said.

Rodriguez was ordered released from jail on his own recognizance shortly after the U.S. Supreme Court ruling.

Since their cases also have been dismissed against ex-priests Michael Wernig, George Neville Rucker, John Anthony Salazar and Matthew Michael Sironi.

Four other former priests are due in court over the next month to find out whether their cases will go forward or be dropped.

Another former priest, along with an ex-seminary student, were awaiting extradition when the nation's highest court made its ruling on the California law.

MN 7/1/03

CMOB-013

Former Priest Charged With Molestation to be Released

(CNS)—A former priest accused of child molestation was ordered released from jail yesterday in light of a U.S. Supreme Court ruling striking down a law allowing for prosecution of old sex crimes.

Los Angeles Superior Court Judge David Horwitz ordered Carlos Rene Rodriguez—who has been in custody for about nine months—released on his own recognizance.

It's unclear when the release-processing procedure would be completed and Rodriguez freed, said defense attorney Arthur Braudrick.

Rodriguez, 46, is due back in court July 9, when prosecutors are expected to announce whether they will oppose the case being dismissed.

Rodriguez's lawyer told reporters outside court that he fully expects the case to be dismissed then—likely on the prosecution's own motion.

"Mr. Rodriguez wants to get out of jail, live his life and put all this behind him," Braudrick said.

Rodriguez is the third former priest to be ordered released from jail on his own recognizance in connection with the Supreme Court's ruling.

Last week, former priests Michael Wempe and Lawrence Joseph Lovell were ordered released from jail as a result of the high court's ruling. Their cases are due back in court July 8 and July 11, respectively.

Meanwhile, also yesterday, Los Angeles Superior Court Commissioner Jeffrey Harkavy said he will likely grant the defense's motion to dismiss the case against another former priest, John Anthony Salazar.

The commissioner gave the prosecution two days to evaluate its options in light of the high court's ruling.

Salazar was escorted out a back exit of the downtown Los Angeles courthouse by sheriff's deputies.

Salazar, Rodriguez, Wempe and Lovell are among 10 former priests recently charged in connection with child molestation cases, with charges against one dating back to the 1940s.

Two priests already have been ordered to stand trial; others are awaiting similar hearings or extradition from other states or Canada.

Besides the former priests, prosecutors have filed criminal charges against a former secondary student accused of molesting two boys in the 1980s.


Several other potential cases remain under investigation by the Los Angeles Police and Sheriff's departments and other agencies in Los Angeles County, according to officials with the District Attorney's Office.

After the Supreme Court's ruling last week, District Attorney Steve Cooley said his office will review more than 200 cases that might be affected.

Los Angeles T

On The Internet: WWW.LATIMES.COM

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 2003



FREED: Retired priest Michael Wempe, center, walks out of County Jail in Los Angeles after a judge ordered his release on his own recognizance. He had been held on \$2-million bail on charges of molesting five boys 20 years ago. GERARDO MOLINA, Los Angeles Times

Cell Doors Swing Open After Ruling on Molestation Cases

BY TRACY WILSON
AND MEGAN GARVEY
Times Staff Writers

It was 2:20 a.m., and Ray Lovell was one of the first out of the 63-year detroked priest awaiting trial on charges of molesting four altar boys at the historic San Gabriel Mission left Los Angeles County Jail after less than a week behind bars.

Twelve hours later, Michael Wempe, a retired priest, whose bail had been set two weeks ago at \$2 million, had been charged with molesting five boys 20 years ago.

Both men have denied the charges against them. At hearings next week, their cases are likely to be dismissed, prosecutors say.

And so it went Friday, as prosecutors, defense attorneys and the state attorney general's office scrambled to come to grips with the repercussions of a U.S. Supreme Court decision invalidating a California law that had allowed decades-old child molestation cases to be prosecuted.

Lovell and Wempe are among hundreds of people — some convicted, some confessed, some still awaiting trial — who will be released from jails and prisons across California or whose cases will be dropped as a result of Thursday's decision.

The five justices in the high court majority ruled that Califor-

RELATED STORY

Burden of proof: Hundreds of civil cases are also affected. A24

nia had violated the Constitution's ban on ex post facto — after the fact — laws when the Legislature decided to change the time limit for bringing criminal charges in child sex-abuse

cases and made the new limit retroactive to cover long-ago cases.

For many prosecutors, victims' advocates and police, the court's decision was hard to take.

The affected cases all involve not just allegations of abuse, but strong corroborating evidence, which was required under the

[See Abuse, Page A23]

Freedom for Many in Child Molestation Cases

[Abuse from Page A1]
1994 law that the high court struck down.

"These are cases where almost always the perpetrator admitted the abuse in either direct interviews with investigators or the victims played a role in gathering evidence, making ... phone calls or meeting with the person while they were wired," said Kevin Murphy, a sex crimes prosecutor in Alameda County.

Friday morning, Murphy dismissed the case against Stephen Kiese, a former priest who had told investigators that he molested a number of children three decades ago.

Kiese had served time in the late 1970s in a separate child molestation case.

In Santa Clara County, Assistant Dist. Atty. Chuck Willingham spent long hours after the ruling, calling victims to let them know the outcome. About 100 cases in his county will be affected.

"I'm sorry," he told nearly a dozen men and women with whom he had worked to build strong cases. "This is terrible, and there's really nothing we can do about it."

The response, Willingham said, has been "anger, disbelief, confusion, a lack of understanding as to how this could have possibly happened, resignation to outrage. These are not easy conversations to be a part of."

Willingham mentioned one case involving a husband and wife convicted on multiple counts of molesting children. A sentencing hearing had been scheduled for them for next week and they faced life in prison. Instead, they will be released.

"The reality is, they won the child sexual predator lottery yesterday," Willingham said. "They won the jackpot." He also noted that, with their convictions overturned, those getting out of jail will not be required to register as sex offenders.

"You're scot-free," he said. "Thank you very much."

But Kay Duffy, attorney for Father Carl Sutphin, 71, who is charged with 14 counts of molestation, disputed that evaluation.

"Her client may no longer face prison as a result of the court ruling, but his life has been turned upside down by being publicly labeled a child molester," she said.

"I don't think anybody is walking away from this thinking they got away with something," Duffy said.



PROTEST: Members of Survivors Network of Those Abused by Priests demonstrate against court ruling outside the Reagan state office building in downtown Los Angeles.

"These people have been tried and convicted in the press already and they still have to live with that stigma for the rest of their lives."

Sutphin's lawyers have agreed to wait until after his alleged victims are contacted before seeking dismissal of the charges against him. Ventura County Chief Deputy Dist. Atty. Michael Frawley, who has been part of the prosecution effort against Sutphin, signed as he talked about the slow and painstaking process now facing prosecutors.

"Here's our problem," Frawley said. "Not only is there a lot to do, but there is a great deal of disappointment walking the halls here. A lot of people put in a lot of effort to make those cases happen."

His prosecutors have not yet dismissed any cases but they have identified at least 20 that

are likely to be overturned as a result of the decision.

The case against Father Fidelio Silva, 53, is one example. Silva, a Catholic priest who from 1978 until 1986 ran the altar boy program at a church in Oxnard, was charged with 25 counts of child molestation in March, after a yearlong investigation.

Crimes that occurred after 1994 were not affected by the Supreme Court's decision. Los Angeles Dist. Atty. Steve Cooley has estimated that at least 200 cases in the county may be affected by the ruling. But determining which cases are still viable is a slow process, officials said.

In San Mateo County, Deputy Dist. Atty. Rick Good said having to call the victims was even more upsetting than the news of the ruling.

On Thursday, Good phoned a

woman who had been sexually abused in the 1970s, when she was 13 years old, by Ramiro Jack Long, a Redwood City karate teacher. Good told her that Long, convicted by a jury and expected to serve at least 16 years, would instead be released.

"She was devastated," Good said. The victim, now in her 40s, told Good she feared that Long might now come after her. She wanted to know when he would be released, saying that she planned to move.

Many alleged victims risked a lot by coming forward to testify, said San Bernardino County District Atty. Michael Ramos.

"That's the saddest part of this whole decision, but we will do our best to understand what this fully means and then gently give the news that these people will no longer be held responsible," Ramos said.

"We're calling them and we're trying to keep their spirits up, but we're being very blunt with them. It doesn't appear that they're going to be able to achieve closure with law enforcement and justice. It's been taken away," said Elliot Beckelman, assistant district attorney in San Francisco.

Frawley said his Ventura County prosecutors will continue to reassure people who went to police with allegations of abuse that their efforts made a difference.

"We'll tell them that they didn't do the right thing in coming forward," he said.

"It exposed a huge problem out there, and it served to educate the public about what a dirty secret this is."

Times staff writers Steve Berry, Li Fellers, Jenn Guccione, Hilda Munoz and Lance Pugmire contributed to this report.

ES TIMES

6/24/03

LOS ANGELES

Ex-Priest Faces New Accusations of Abuse

A woman whose brothers were allegedly molested by Father Michael Stephen Baker sues the church, saying she too was a victim.

By RICHARD WINTON
Times Staff Writer

A woman whose brothers were allegedly abused by a Los Angeles Catholic priest sued the church Monday, claiming she too was sexually molested as a child by since-defrocked priest Michael Stephen Baker. Identified only as Cynthia C., the woman alleges that Baker molested her after he admitted to Cardinal Roger M. Mahony that he had abused several youths.

The woman, who now lives in Guadalajara, Mexico, alleges that she was first abused at the age of 13, when she met Baker at a Pico Rivera parish where her mother worked.

The alleged acts of molestation continued after December 1986, when Baker told Mahony that he abused children. Mahony sent him for treatment to a New Mexico facility and restricted his ministry.

The two brothers received a \$1.3-million confidential settlement in 2000 from the archdiocese after alleging that they were abused by Baker from 1984 to 1989. Baker was defrocked in December 2000, after those allegations were

made to the archdiocese. Mahony first notified police about Baker last year.

"This lawsuit is about accountability and truth and what the hierarchy knew, and when they knew it," said John Manly, co-counsel for the woman. "How could the archdiocese keep in their employ someone doing this?"

Tod Tamberg, archdiocese spokesman, said that, since the archdiocese has yet to see the suit, it would refrain from commenting.

Baker, 55, was charged with 34 counts of child molestation in connection with a boy he allegedly abused during the 1970s and 1980s. Investigators believe there are nine or more victims. He has pleaded not guilty.

Mahony has said he met with Baker briefly in 1986, heard his admission and then sent him for treatment. From there, Baker was assigned to a specialized ministry not related to children. Baker received interim assignments to parishes until 2000. Mahony has maintained that he immediately removed Baker from ministry in 2000, when he became aware of new allegations from the brothers. He apologized to priests in May 2002 for failing "to take firm and decisive action much earlier."

Baker, according to the suit, allegedly began molesting Cynthia C. in 1984 when her mother began working at St. Hillary Catholic Church in Pico Rivera. Baker, the suit alleges, mo-

lested two of her brothers and plied them with "money, liquor and sexually oriented magazines" and "a book containing pictures of naked children." The suit alleges that Baker threatened their mother's livelihood if they revealed the abuse.

Around the time that Baker told Mahony about his abusive behavior, the girl's mother relocated to Guadalajara, but the abuse continued as the priest visited the family in Mexico, the suit alleges. The abuse allegedly continued until she was married at 17. The suit, which also named Baker, alleges childhood sexual abuse, assault and battery. It also alleges that the archdiocese was negligent and inflicted emotional distress.

Mahony said he met with Baker briefly in 1986, heard his admission and then sent him for treatment. From there, Baker was assigned to a specialized ministry not related to children. Baker received interim assignments to parishes until 2000. Mahony has maintained that he immediately removed Baker from ministry in 2000, when he became aware of new allegations from the brothers. He apologized to priests in May 2002 for failing "to take firm and decisive action much earlier."

Baker, according to the suit, allegedly began molesting Cynthia C. in 1984 when her mother began working at St. Hillary Catholic Church in Pico Rivera. Baker, the suit alleges, mo-

lested two of her brothers and plied them with "money, liquor and sexually oriented magazines" and "a book containing pictures of naked children." The suit alleges that Baker threatened their mother's livelihood if they revealed the abuse.

Priest Sued by Brothers Is Arrested on Suspicion of Child Molestation

Retired clergyman is to be charged with abusing five children in the 1970s and '80s. Mahony has conceded that he mishandled case.

By RICHARD WINTON
Times Staff Writer

Michael Wempe, a now-retired priest whom Cardinal Roger M. Mahony said he erred in transferring after accusations of sexual abuse, was arrested Thursday on suspicion of child molestation.

The arrest of Wempe near his Seal Beach retirement home took place as the clergy sexual abuse crisis dominated the opening day of the annual conference of Roman Catholic bishops in St. Louis. Los Angeles County sheriff's deputies arrested Wempe as he was on his way to play golf.

"I hope the news gets to Mahony and someone shoves a microphone in his face and asks what he thinks about his friend Michael Wempe being taken in, someone who he has hidden all these years," said Lee Bashforth, a Newport Beach financial advisor who alleged he was molested as a boy for eight years by Wempe.

Los Angeles County Dist. Atty. Steve Cooley said multiple charges would be filed against Wempe alleging that he molested five children between the ages of 7 and 18 from 1977 to 1986. Bail was set at \$2 million.

"Some cases do stand out, and Father Wempe's is one of them," Cooley said. "This is an egregious case with allegations of sexual abuse in three counties. Despite archdiocese stonewalling, we were able to bring him to justice."

Another retired Los Angeles priest, Titian A. Miani, 76, was arrested Thursday on suspicion of molesting two young girls. Another, Matthew Michael Sprouffske, was ordered Thursday to stand trial for molestation.

Eight other priests or former priests in the archdiocese have been charged with sexually abusing minors. Prosecutors said they expect to charge another 10.

Wempe's attorney, Leonard Levine, said that his client intends to plead not guilty "and is very hopeful that when all the facts come out, he will be exonerated."

Wempe, 63, was among seven priests Mahony forced into retirement last year as the sex abuse scandal escalated and the cardinal retroactively applied a zero-tolerance policy for abusers in the Los Angeles Archdiocese, the largest in the United States. Wempe was forced from the ministry and retired as chaplain of Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. He was living at a nearby parish house attached to a school south of Hancock Park.

Mahony has said he knew since 1987 or 1988 of allegations against Wempe. Mahony told



ARRESTED: Retired priest Michael Wempe is taken into custody by sheriff's deputies Thursday near his Seal Beach home.

The Times last April that, in retrospect, he should have forced Wempe to resign immediately after hearing of the sexual abuse allegations.

He said he should have never assigned Wempe to Cedars in 1988 without informing hospital officials that he had removed the priest from his parish and ordered him to a New Mexico treatment facility for evaluation and counseling.

Mahony insisted that experts had told him that Wempe could be trusted to work in a place without access to children. The cardinal said he did not know the hospital had a pediatrics unit.

Mahony did not report Wempe's abuse allegations to police until last year. He told The Times that he thought a therapist who saw Wempe had reported it earlier. None of the charges Cooley said he would file Monday involve Wempe's period at Cedars, officials said.

"We have known about the investigation for over a year and cooperated throughout," said Donald Steier, another attorney for Wempe. "I am pleased to say at least they didn't arrest him in front of his aged and ill mother."

Steier said Wempe would have surrendered if asked, and added that the \$2-million bail was "ridiculous."

Officials in San Diego and Ventura counties, where some of the alleged crimes were committed, agreed to Wempe's prosecution in Los Angeles, Cooley said.

Cooley said Wempe's arrest would not have been possible without a new law that froze the statute of limitations in many older abuse cases. Cooley and other prosecutors lobbied for the change after the archdiocese fought subpoenas for church records.

Wempe's church files were among those demanded by a Los Angeles County Grand Jury last year. The church has fought release to prosecutors of documents reflecting communications between the cardinal and priests, claiming that release of the papers would infringe on the church's free exercise of religion. The dispute is pending before a judge.

"If they'd fully cooperated on this case, Wempe would have been filed a lot sooner," said Cooley, who repeated his call to Mahony to give up the records.

Archdiocesan officials insisted that they only sought to protect rights of the church and priests.

"The charge of stonewalling is preposterous," said Tod Tarnberg, spokesman for the archdiocese. "The district attorney knows fully well the privacy laws of California."

Wempe was ordained in 1966 and then assigned to an Inglewood-area parish. In 1974, he was assigned to St. Jude parish in Westlake Village, where two brothers alleged in a lawsuit filed last April that Wempe began to molest them and continued to

abuse them despite transfers to several other parishes.

Lee Bashforth and his brother Mark were 8 and 12, respectively, when they met the motorcycle-riding Wempe. Mark Bashforth told The Times that the priest was a "trusted family friend" who molested them on overnight trips and in his parish room. Lee Bashforth, 33, said he spent the night with Wempe in his bed in the rectory.

According to the brothers' lawsuit, the abuse continued when Wempe was transferred to Sacred Heart parish in Ventura and St. Mary's parish in Palm Dale.

On Thursday, Lee Bashforth said he suppressed the memory until last year.

"I am beside myself with emotion," Lee Bashforth said, weeping. "I never thought this day would come. My brother shares my relief. I got a call from a detective and prosecutor this morning. These disgusting predators of children and those who conceal them will be brought to justice."

Another altar boy at St. Jude's who sued over abuse rejoiced Thursday.

"Another sexual predator is finally off the streets. The D.A.'s office and sheriff have been survivor-friendly throughout this investigation," said Richard Kirby, 39, a Washington lobbyist.

The Wempe prosecution, like most others, relies on a California law that allows old cases to be filed where there is recent discovery of serious substantial sexual abuse of a child. The U.S. Supreme Court is now reviewing a challenge to the law.

On Thursday, retired priest Sprouffske was ordered to stand trial on charges of sexually abusing his cousin during the 1950s while assigned to Mount Carmel High School in Los Angeles.

In Los Angeles County Superior Court, prosecutors played a tape of Sprouffske, 76, admitting that he molested a girl, who, when assaulted, was about 5 years old. The tape, a recording of a conversation between the two, was made without his knowledge.

The allegations against Miani date to the 1960s. Miani was taken into custody by Los Angeles County sheriff's deputies at his Stockton home and will be arraigned Monday.

LA Times 10/1/02

Accused Priest Waives Extradition

Church: Pulled off a cruise ship by Alaskan officials, he faces charges of molesting seven girls.

By RICHARD WINTON
and JEAN GUCCIONE
TIMES STAFF WRITERS

A Los Angeles priest charged with molesting seven girls who was plucked off a cruise ship headed for Russia has waived extradition, Alaska court officials said Monday.



G. Neville Rucker

G. Neville Rucker, a retired priest, will be returned to Los Angeles as soon as bad weather clears in the Aleutian Islands and he can be flown 800 miles to Anchorage, where he will be met by Los Angeles police detectives, said

Greg Wilkinson, an Alaska state trooper.

During a hearing in the Unalaska District Court, Rucker waived his right to an extradition hearing and told the judge his attorney advised him to return to California. Bail was set at \$1 mil-

lion.

Rucker was one of seven priests removed by Cardinal Roger M. Mahony from the ministry earlier this year when he implemented a zero-tolerance policy for those who previously abused minors.

So-called abuse priest's Michael Wempe was sued Monday by a 39-year-old former altar boy, Richard Kirby of Leesburg, Va., alleges that Wempe, a retired priest, molested him between 1975 and 1977 while serving at St. Jude Church in Westlake Village. Two others have sued Wempe.

Los Angeles County sheriff's investigators are probing at least four allegations of sexual abuse against Wempe.

Rucker, 82, was arrested Friday by Alaska state troopers aboard the cruise ship ms Volendam after the U.S. Coast Guard, at the request of the LAPD, ordered an unscheduled stop in the remote port of Dutch Harbor in the Aleutian Islands, officials said.

The ship was on a 64-day Pacific Circle cruise that began Sept. 23 in Vancouver, Canada.

"We pulled him off the ship and put him on a tugboat in heavy seas. We had him harnessed and surrounded so he had no opportunity to fall overboard or jump overboard," Trooper Kim Babcock said.

Rucker is charged with 23



BRIAN WALSKI / Los Angeles Times

Richard Kirby, above, is suing retired priest Michael Wempe, who, along with Rucker, was removed by the cardinal this year.

counts of lewd conduct with a child. Prosecutors allege he molested seven girls—all under 14—between 1947 and 1976.

At a news conference outside the Los Angeles County Courthouse on Monday, Kirby said he was not only humiliated by the abuse he suffered decades ago, but again after he wrote an opinion piece with Mahony in The Times that advocated an "open and accountable" relationship between

the church and victims.

"Since July, I have been depressed and disappointed by the cardinal's deceptions and my role in telling people the church was changing. I feel the same as when I was abused 25 years ago," Kirby said.

Kirby said he felt misled by Mahony's pledge to help victims of sexual abuse by priests.

His attorney, Jeffrey Anderson of St. Paul, Minn., has asked a Los Angeles County Superior Court judge to stop church officials from collecting data from sexual abuse victims for use in their defense against future litigation. The lawsuit also names Mahony and the archdiocese, and alleges they conspired to conceal information about Wempe, then used Kirby as part of their public relations campaign.

Attorney J. Michael Hennigan, who represents the archdiocese, called Kirby's request for an independent court official to collect data on abuse "preposterous" and "a publicity stunt."

He said the archdiocese takes histories from only those victims demanding money to settle out-of-court claims. He said Kirby asked for \$2 million.

"I think our relationship with him soured after that," Hennigan said. "We're struggling to deal with staffing issues, and he wants \$2 million."

Southern California

LOS ANGELES DAILY JOURNAL • FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 2003 • PAGE 2

Police Arrest Two Former Priests

By Anne La Jeunesse

Daily Journal Staff Writer

Two former Roman Catholic priests were arrested Thursday on suspicion of child molestation, the same day that a Los Angeles County Superior Court judge ordered a third, retired priest to stand trial for allegedly molesting a young girl in the 1950s.

Michael Wempe, 53, who was arrested outside his Seal Beach home, is a significant figure in the sexual abuse scandal that continues to grow around the Los Angeles Archdiocese and Cardinal Roger Mahony, authorities said.

Last year, Mahony apologized to parishioners for transferring Wempe to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center without disclosing sexual abuse allegations against him to hospital authorities or the police. After declaring a zero tolerance policy, Mahony last year forced Wempe and other clerics out of the priesthood.

Wempe is accused of molesting five boys aged 7 to 16 at various locations in Los Angeles, Ventura and San Diego counties during a nine-year period beginning in 1977.

The other retired priest, William A. Miani, 76, was arrested by Stockton police, in cooperation with Los Angeles Sheriff's deputies, at his home in Stockton. He is suspected of molesting two young girls in the mid 1960s when he worked in the Los Angeles Archdiocese.

Defense attorney Donald Steier, who is defending Miani, said both men will be pleading not guilty.

The pair offered to surrender, but the district attorney arrested them because he wanted the publicity, Steier charged.

"It's a lot simpler in cases where people are making no effort to flee and their in their 70s and 80s to allow a surrender," Steier said. "But these cases are obvious-

ly being handled differently."

"[Wempe] intends to plead not guilty when he is arraigned on Monday, and he is hopeful that when all the facts are out they will totally exonerate him," said Wempe's defense attorney Leonard Levine.

The arrests bring the total number of clerics arrested on suspicion of child molestation in Los Angeles County to 11, including one seminarian.

A source in the district attorney's office said that perhaps a dozen more priests soon could be arrested on similar charges.

Head Deputy District Attorney William Hodgman, who heads the office's probe into the clergy scandal, declined to comment on that report, but said he expects other priest investigations to come to a head this summer.

"The investigations in these cases have evolved to a point where we were ready to make arrests and charge, and we'll be considering others throughout the summer," Hodgman said.

Sergeant Dan Scott, of the Sheriff's Department's family crimes bureau, said the archdiocese has made prosecution difficult by refusing to turn over church documents disclosing when abuse allegations were first made, and what Mahony and others did about them.

Church lawyer J. Michael Hennigan could not be reached for comment.

Wempe is being held in lieu of \$2 million bail in Los Angeles County Jail, and will be charged with multiple counts of molestation Monday, according to district attorney's office spokeswoman Jane Robison.

Details of Miani's bail were not immediately available, but according to the district attorney's office, he will be formally charged and arraigned Monday.

Meanwhile, Superior Court Judge Frederick N. Wapner ordered one of

Wempe and Miani's former brethren, retired priest Matthew Michael Sprouffske, 76, to stand trial for molesting his young female cousin in the 1950s.

Sprouffske, who lives in Hawthorne, according to tax records, is free on \$25,000 bail. He has pleaded not guilty to four felony counts of committing a lewd act upon a child under the age of 14, referred to only as Patricia K. in court.

The decision came after the alleged victim, Patricia K., now a computer graphic artist, testified that starting when she was as young as 4 or 5 years old, Sprouffske fondled her buttocks and had her masturbate him while he was driving.

"It was very uncomfortable. It felt really wrong," she said.

Deputy District Attorney Christina Weiss asked Patricia K. if Sprouffske had ever threatened her.

"He said, 'Don't ever tell anyone what we do together or I will get you.' Those were his words," Patricia K. testified.

Prosecutors said that Sprouffske was assigned to Mount Carmel High School in Los Angeles at the time of the alleged molestations.

Over defense attorney Gerald Klausner's objections, Wapner admitted into evidence a tape recording of a telephone conversation in which Sprouffske apologized to Patricia K., saying he was "sexually confused" and immature. *People v. Sprouffske*, BA239256, (L.A. Super. Ct., filed Nov. 22, 2002).

Several times Klausner asked Patricia K. if she was suing for money.

"It's not about money," she said. "It's about accountability."

She said she does not believe the church had done what it should do to protect children.

Sprouffske is to be arraigned July 3 in Superior Court.

MICHAEL WEMPE

L.A. Times: LAPD and Ventura sheriff's department currently investigating claims he molested three boys between 1976-1985.

V/C: Reported initially by his pastor. He was removed from ministry at that time and received treatment. He came back and was assigned to hospital ministry. Retired. No new reports.

Facts: Age 62, ordained 1966; letter from V/C to Cardinal requesting laicization as of 8/2/02. Retired 2/125/02. Living now: REDACTED
REDACTED

Victims: REDACTED (source: V/C – filed lawsuit, public)
REDACTED (source: Asst. Min./ L.A. Times – wrote ltr to Cardinal.)
REDACTED and REDACTED (source: Asst. Min.)
REDACTED (source: Asst. Min.)
REDACTED source: Asst. Min.)
(source: Asst. Min)
REDACTED (source: V/C, ltr to REDACTED

Sequence of events per file:

February 1978 First entry: memo stating three separate priests recommend professional help for Fr.

May 1987 Psychologist mentioned.

May 15, 1987 Fr. meets w/Mahony re status

May 19, 1987 Ltr from V/C (Curry) to Fr. re meeting and status- requests presence at personnel board meeting on 6/3

Phone calls to V/C.office: Fr does not want to attend, Mahony told him that was O.K. V/C not in office at the time.

May 22, 1987 Ltr from pastor to V/C (Curry) – serious concerns/facts about behavior w/specific young boys prior to pastor's arrival and on-going. REDACTED & REDACTED told him to write.

May 29, 1987 Ltr from Mahony to Fr. – mentions diabetes/bronchitis in relation to transfers, please attend 6/3 personnel board mtg.

June, 1987 Mahony is made aware and responds: "We need to move on this".

June 22, 1987 Fr is scheduled to go to treatment at Jemez Spring, NM for diagnostic program

When will he go?

November 1987	Still in program. Definite need for continued therapy. Disagreement within staff re assignment to hospital ministry for Fr.	✓
January 1988	Assigned to Mt. Sinai Hospital	
February 1988	Fr at St. Ambrose (continues group therapy)	
March 1988	Victim ^{REDACTED} spoke to REDACTED ; victim received therapy.	
April 1988	Psych assessment: Of six <u>priests</u> , Fr the most likely to repeat.	?
December 1988	Therapist: Progress is slow; REDACTED , not out of danger	
February 1989	Mahony aware and responds (re: progress and REDACTED)	
September 1989	Memo from therapist: "Doing well, does not need group therapy unless he wants it"; continues individual therapy. Mahony aware and responds.	
September 1994	Ltr to Fr re his therapist (who is being reviewed about his practice)	
February 2002	Resignation of Fr sent to Cedars Sinai, he cites "health problems, term limits, mother's health".	
March 7, 2002	Ltr from victim ^{REDACTED} to Mahony re abuse in 1976-78 at the age of 14-16 years. His therapist (for ten years) reported to police	?
March 27, 2002	V/C (Cox) responds to victim's ltr. – encourages call to LAPD, would like to meet/interview him (lives in VA); gave Sr. REDACTED number.	
March 29, 2002	Fr retiring.	
April 2002	Fr retains counsel Ltr from Cedars-Sinai stating April 10, 2002 retirement reception is cancelled due to family illness of Fr. April 20-21, 2002 – statement read at Masses at St. Mary's, Palmdale.	
August 2, 2002	Mentioned in ltr from V/C to Cardinal re laicization.	

CMOB-013-01

"House Trailer" -- Anglo, age 62, ordained in 1966. Reported in 1987 initially by his recently-arrived pastor who was confronted by housekeeper with past behavior of Father X involving a ten yr. old boy sleeping with Father X several times; pastor also concerned about Father X behavior taking young boys to his house trailer and using firearms. Father X was removed from ministry and sent for treatment. In 1988 two brothers accused Father X of abuse in his camper when they were young teens. In March of 2002, an apprx. 40-yr. old man accused Father X of abuse from 1976 to 1978, also mentioning a cabin and vacation trailer. Four additional calls have come into Assistance Ministry, and there is one lawsuit pending. LAPD and Ventura County sheriff are investigating. Father X is retired and no longer in active ministry. Announcements have been made in the parish Father X was at from 1978-1984.

When?

His name was mentioned in August 2, 2002 letter to Cardinal from V/C for possible laicization.

LA Times 8/14/04

Jailed Priest Accused of Molesting Sees Bail Lowered

Michael Wempe will be freed if he agrees not to perform priestly duties and wears an electronic monitor. He faces 20 years on charges.

By JEAN GUCCIONE
Times Staff Writer

The only Roman Catholic priest still jailed for allegedly molesting children in Los Angeles County could be out next week if he posts a newly reduced bail and promises not to perform priestly functions while awaiting trial.

Instead of a passport, lawyers for Michael Edwin Wempe offered to surrender his clerical collar Friday.

The 64-year-old retired priest is expected to come up with the \$100,000 bond within the next few days and return to the Seal Beach retirement home he

shared with his ailing mother until his arrest in September.

A judge reduced Wempe's bail from \$500,000, warning that if he flees, his action would be considered "virtually an admission of guilt."

Retired Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Samuel Mayerson also ordered Wempe to wear an electronic device to monitor his whereabouts.

He must stay inside his house except to see his doctors and lawyers, shop for groceries and attend Mass — which the judge warned he could do so only as a participant, not the celebrant.

Deputy Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks, who opposed the bail reduction, said he was disappointed with the ruling.

In court, he said Wempe, who faces up to 20 years in prison, might be tempted to run based on the strength of the evidence presented against him at a week-long preliminary hearing in February. He also said he feared the priest would abuse again.

But Wempe's lawyers, Leonard Levine and Donald Steier, successfully argued that the cleric was neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community.

Defense lawyers said he hasn't fled during a lengthy and open police investigation. Last summer, Wempe was charged with 42 counts of sexually molesting 13 boys between 1977 and 1986.

A few days later, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a 1994 California law allowing retroactive prosecution involving older sex crimes against children. As a result, criminal charges against Wempe and nine other priests were dismissed.

In the current case, prosecutors allege Wempe molested a boy in his chaplain's office at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center between 1990 and 1995.

The victim did not report his allegations until earlier charges against Wempe — involving the victim's older brother — were dismissed.

One of the victim's brothers compared the judge's decision allowing Wempe to live in a retirement home where grandchildren come to visit their relatives to Cardinal Roger M. Mahony's decision to place Wempe in a hospital with a pediatric ward, after he was removed from his church parish amid allegations of child molestation.

Mahony forced Wempe to retire from the priesthood in 2002, and barred him from active ministry, Wempe's defense lawyers said. Yet Wempe nodded yes when Mayerson asked his lawyers Friday if he was still a priest.

Wempe is one of two retired priests facing child molestation charges in Los Angeles County. The other, Stephen Charles Hernandez, posted \$240,000 bail after he was arrested in June. He faces 12 felony counts involving a 14-year-old boy he allegedly molested in 2001 and 2002 while he was counseling minors at Central Juvenile Hall, also known as Eastlake.

DS 6/28/04 Former Priest Must Face Trial for Molestation, Judge Says

By Joy C. Shaw

Daily Journal Staff Writer

A former Catholic priest must face criminal prosecution for allegedly molesting a minor between 1990 and 1995, a judge ruled Friday.

Retired judge Samuel Mayerson, sitting on assignment, ruled there was enough evidence presented at a preliminary hearing to hold Michael Wempe for trial.

Mayerson also rejected contentions by Wempe's defense attorney that the charges should be thrown out because they fall outside the three-year statute of limitations for filing molestation charges. *People v. Wempe*, BA253178 (L.A. Super. Ct., filed Sept. 11, 2003).

Prosecutors said under California Penal Code Section 803(g), molestation

charges can be filed within a year of the accuser coming forward, no matter how long ago the abuse allegedly occurred.

"We are very pleased with the judge's decision today, said deputy district attorney R. Todd Hicks, adding that state and federal law has had a long history in extending statute of limitation in prosecution of serious crimes. "I think the law is quite clear in this area."

Donald Steier, attorney representing Wempe, however, said extending the statute is a "gray area" in California law, and vowed to challenge the district attorney's use of a 803(g) if Wempe is convicted.

"Our legal argument, we feel, is very strong but politics is against us," Steier said after Friday's hearing.

Last June, the U.S. Supreme Court, said

803(g) can't be applied retroactively, and it threw out hundreds of sexual abuse cases across the state. *Stogner v. California*, 2003 DJDAR 6989 (U.S. Sup. Ct. June 26, 2003).

The decision forced Los Angeles district attorney to abandon prosecution of decades-old sex crimes — including those allegedly committed by several Catholic priests.

Leonard Levine, another attorney for Wempe, said he wasn't surprised by the judge's ruling Friday given the low standard of proof the prosecution must offer at a preliminary hearing.

"We think when proven beyond a reasonable doubt as required then the prosecution will fall well short of that standard," Levine said.

"We are still confident that when this

case comes to trial [Wempe] will be totally exonerated of all these charges."

The alleged victim, Jayson B., now 25, reported the molestation to the police in August 2003 after learning that Wempe would be released from jail because of the *Stogner* decision. Wempe had been under investigation for earlier child molestation claims made by two of Jason's older brothers.

Meanwhile, Judge Mayerson put off until Aug. 2 a hearing on whether the Los Angeles Archdiocese must turn over confidential documents related to Wempe.

Attorneys for the archdiocese had declined to turn over any document subpoenaed by the district attorney in the Wempe case, claiming they are privileged

2/20/04

4 Priests Face New Abuse Charges

Earlier cases were dismissed or dropped after a ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court

By RICHARD W. LUTTEN
Times Staff Writer

Four of 10 priests accused of sexual abuse charges in Los Angeles County last summer after a U.S. Supreme Court decision are facing new charges of sexual abuse.

One former priest, who was in prison in Texas for other crimes, is awaiting sentencing, and the fourth is awaiting trial on new charges.

"One by one, these guys are going down," said Los Angeles County Deputy Dist. Atty. Wilham Hodgeman, "if they struck once, they tend to strike again."

The U.S. Supreme Court struck down the 1994 California law allowing the retroactive prosecution of decades-old child sex crimes. But the state attorney general's office has concluded that crimes that occurred after Jan. 1, 1983, are still prosecutable.

Michael Wempe faces trial on allegations that he sexually abused a boy in his hospital chaplain's office as recently as 1995. Earlier molestation charges against Wempe were dropped last summer. He was

forced to retire from the Diocese of Los Angeles in 2002.

John Anthony Salazar was charged with sexually assaulting an 18-year-old in a Texas hotel in last September six months after charges were dismissed against him for molesting two boys in the 1980s at an Eastside Los Angeles parish. Salazar, who was working as a priest at the time of the alleged assault, has since been moved from the ministry.

Lawrence Lovell, who has been removed from the priesthood, is awaiting sentencing in Prescott, Ariz., for molesting a 13-year-old boy there in the late 1970s. Charges that Lovell

(See Priests, Page B3)

4 Priests Face New Sex Abuse Charges

[Priests, from Page B1]

abused four altar boys at the San Gabriel Mission from 1980 to 1984 were dropped last year after the high court decision.

■ Carlos Rene Rodriguez faces 10 years in prison after pleading guilty to molesting two boys at a Santa Paula parish from 1988 to 1993. Rodriguez was arrested in December, five months after charges that he molested a Los Angeles altar boy in the 1980s were dismissed. He has been removed from the ministry.


Hodgman, the L.A. County prosecutor, said his office is continuing to pursue charges against the 10 priests.

"We haven't finished yet in Los Angeles," he said. "I can say, we expect to charge some of these guys again. It's far from over."

On Wednesday, the 64-year-old Wempe was ordered to stand trial for allegedly molesting a boy, now age 24, as recently as 1995 — a year within the new window of prosecution.

The alleged victim came forward last fall after publicity over the dismissal of charges against Wempe that he molested two brothers in the 1970s — crimes too old to prosecute under the high court ruling.


Wempe is charged with molesting the boy between 1990 and 1995 in his car and chaplain's office at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. He was assigned there by Cardinal Roger M. Mahony af-



CARLOS RODRIGUEZ: He has admitted molesting two boys in Santa Paula.



MICHAEL WEMPE: He is charged with molesting a boy at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center.



JOHN SALAZAR: He is charged with a sexual assault in September in Texas.

2:30 a.m. after the man, feeling sick, was helped to his room by Salazar. The man reported it the next day to the Amarillo Diocese, which contacted police.

Hospital tests conducted after the assault supported the man's allegation, Blackmon said. Salazar is being held at the Dallas County Jail in lieu of \$500,000 bail. His attorney has denied the charges.

Lovell was convicted of molesting a boy in the San Gabriel Mission in 1986 and subsequently left the ministry. New charges that Lovell abused four additional altar boys at the San Gabriel Mission from 1980 to 1984 were dropped last year after the Supreme Court decision.

He pleaded guilty recently to molesting a boy in Prescott, Ariz., in 1985 and is awaiting sentencing.

A Maricopa County grand jury indicted him last month for fondling an altar boy at Sacred Heart parish in Phoenix from July 1984 to May 1985, said Bill Fitzgerald, spokesman for the county district attorney.

Lovell faces a prison term of five to 15 years at sentencing, according to the plea.

In Ventura County, Carlos Rodriguez, 48, pleaded guilty to molesting two boys while serving at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church in Santa Paula from 1988 to 1993. According to his attorney, James Farley, he decided to plead guilty to spare the victims from testifying.

priests, he was hired by the Diocese of Amarillo in Texas in 1991, officials said.

Salazar was a parish priest at the Church of the Holy Spirit in Tullia, Texas, until April 2002 when he was forced out of the ministry by Bishop John Yanta. The diocese cut off financial assistance for him in September after the latest allegations, said Cathy Lexa, diocese spokeswoman.

Blackmon said it was in Tullia that Salazar met the man he allegedly assaulted Sept. 21 as they stayed at the Days Inn in Irving, Texas, for a wedding. The assault allegedly occurred about

lazar was previously imprisoned on a California conviction for child abuse.

"Under Texas law, because he has a prior conviction for a sex crime in California, it's a life sentence here," said Howard Blackmon, a Dallas County assistant district attorney.

Salazar, 48, was convicted in 1987 of molesting two boys, ages 13 and 14, in his living quarters at St. Lucy Church in Los Angeles.

A registered sex offender, he served nearly three years of a six-year prison sentence.

After he was assigned to a church-run New Mexico treatment facility for sexually abusive

CALIFORNIA

2/19/04

LOS ANGELES TIMES

Los Angeles

Retired Priest to Be Tried

Judge orders Michael Wempe to stand trial on charges of molesting a boy in the 1990s.

By ANNA GORMAN
Times Staff Writer

A judge Wednesday ordered retired Roman Catholic priest Michael Wempe, accused of repeated child abuse, to stand trial on charges of sexually molesting a boy between 1990 and 1995.

Los Angeles County Superior Court Judge Jacob Adajian ruled after a weeklong hearing that there was enough evidence against Wempe, 64, for a trial. He faces the possibility of more than 20 years in prison if convicted.

The alleged victim, now 24, testified that Wempe molested him in the priest's car and in his

office at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. Two other alleged victims also testified that Wempe molested them.

Cardinal Roger M. Mahony of the Los Angeles Archdiocese has acknowledged that after learning of earlier abuse allegations against Wempe, he sent the priest for treatment and then transferred him to a chaplain job at Cedars-Sinai. In retrospect, Mahony has said, he should have forced Wempe to resign.

Charges that Wempe earlier molested the alleged victim's two older brothers and three others were dismissed last year after the U.S. Supreme Court invalidated the prosecution of decades-old molestation cases. The former priest was one of 10 whose Los Angeles County cases were thrown out. He was rearrested when the youngest brother came forward and alleged that he had

been molested more recently.

"The defendant's crimes are terrible," said Deputy Dist. Atty. Todd Hicks. "They are sinful."

But one of Wempe's defense attorneys, Leonard B. Levine, attacked the credibility of the alleged victim in this case, accusing him of making up the allegations to seek revenge for his two older brothers. One of the brothers told a reporter after the Supreme Court ruling that he could understand people taking justice into their own hands.

"It's clear from the evidence that these allegations were likely fabricated," Levine said outside court.

In 1974, Wempe started working at St. Jude parish in Westlake Village, where the alleged victim's two older brothers claimed that Wempe molested them on overnight trips and in his parish room. In 2002 the brothers filed a



Los Angeles Times
Retired priest Michael Wempe will return to court March 3.

lawsuit in which they alleged that Wempe had continued to abuse them despite transfers to other parishes.

According to a report released by Mahony this week, Wempe was accused of molesting 13 youths from 1972 to 1995. He is being held in lieu of \$500,000 bail in Los Angeles County Jail and is scheduled to return to court March 3.

9-11-03

latimes.com/california

Priest Held in Alleged Sex Abuse

Earlier charges against the former Cedars-Sinai chaplain were dismissed after a high court ruling. New allegations aren't affected by that decision.

By RICHARD WINTON
Times Staff Writer

A retired Roman Catholic priest reassigned by Cardinal Roger M. Mahony to Cedars-Sinai Medical Center after the priest was accused of molesting boys in the 1980s was arrested Wednesday on suspicion of sexually abusing a child in his chaplain's office at the hospital from 1990 to 1995.

The Rev. Michael Wempe was one of 10 priests whose charges of sexual abuse were dismissed this summer after a U.S. Supreme Court decision invalidated the prosecution of decades-old molestation cases. The 63-year-old cleric had been charged in June with molesting five boys between 1977 and 1988 in Westlake Village, Palmdale and Ventura. He was released from jail this summer in the wake of the court ruling.

The new allegations, prosecutors said, cover a time period not affected by the high court decision.

The latest reported victim, now 24 years old, came forward only after hearing the other charges against Wempe had been dropped, authorities said. Wempe, who was arrested while eating breakfast at his Seal Beach retirement home, is being held in lieu of \$2-million bail.

Mary Grant, spokeswoman for the California chapter of Survivors Network for those Abused by Priests, said the latest allegations show the consequences of failing to fire and report abusive priests. "This cardinal transferred a priest who molested a new victim," she said.

After learning of the sex abuse allegations, Mahony ordered Wempe to complete psychiatric treatment and then transferred Wempe to Cedars-Sinai in 1988. Mahony later acknowledged he should not have reassigned Wempe without telling hospital officials about the accusations. Instead, Mahony told The Times last year, he should have reported Wempe to police and forced him to immediately resign.

"There had been absolutely no allegations against Wempe following his therapy and during his longtime placement at Cedars-Sinai," said Tod Tamberg, the archdiocese spokesman. "We thought he was one of our success stories. If this allegation proves true, it will be a bitter disappointment."

Donald Steier, one of Wempe's attorneys, also expressed surprise.

"I am shocked. I cannot help but be suspicious of the timing of these allegations after the Supreme Court decision," he said.

[See Priest, Page B10]



GENARO MEDINA/LOS ANGELES TIMES
IN CUSTODY: Michael Wempe was transferred to Cedars-Sinai in 1988 after he was accused of molesting boys.

Priest Arrested for Alleged Sex Abuse

[Priest, from Page B1]
maintaining his client's innocence.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Sgt. Dan Scott of the Family Crimes Bureau, said the alleged victim was 11 when the abuse began in 1990. Wempe was a family friend, the victim told authorities, who allegedly molested him in a car and the chaplain's office, Scott said. The man was not a patient at the hospital at the time.

The alleged victim, who was not identified by authorities, came forward after the Supreme Court ruling, which has affected as many as 800 cases statewide and more than 200 in Los Angeles County. The high court decision voided a state law that

gave prosecutors one year to file charges after they were notified of alleged sex crimes, regardless of when the crimes occurred. Prosecutors say that under the ruling they can file charges only for alleged abuse that happened after 1988.

Wempe's accuser told sheriff's investigators that he "was too ashamed to come forward earlier because he believed that Wempe would be convicted and sentenced on the testimony of the other victims," Scott said.

Cedars-Sinai officials said they first learned of abuse allegations against Wempe after he left the hospital last year.

"Based upon a review of our security records, we have confirmed there were no complaints or claims of misconduct regarding Father Wempe during the time he was assigned by L.A. Archdiocese to the hospital," said Grace Cheng, vice president of public relations.

Mahony forced Wempe to retire last year from the Cedars chaplaincy and from the active clergy, along with six other accused priests, as he retroactively

applied a zero-tolerance policy for sex abusers in the Los Angeles Archdiocese.

Mahony told The Times he had ordered Wempe to a New Mexico treatment facility after the allegations in the 1980s. After treatment, Mahony said, experts told him that Wempe could be trusted to work in a place without access to children, such as a jail or hospital. Mahony said he was unaware that Cedars had a pediatric unit. Mahony said he did not report the abuse allegations to police until last year. He said he thought a therapist who treated Wempe in the 1980s had reported it earlier.

Other alleged victims of Wempe said Wednesday that the arrest showed how the L.A. Archdiocese acted like the Boston Archdiocese under former Cardinal Bernard Law — transferring pedophiles who continued to abuse children.

"Mahony and Bernard Law were reading from the same operating manual," said Lee Bashforth, 33, an alleged victim of Wempe during the 1970s. "They sacrificed young people to these


sexual predators."

Bashforth and his brother were ages 8 and 12, respectively, when, he alleged, Wempe began abusing them at the Westlake Village parish of St. Jude where they served as altar boys. Bashforth was among the five alleged victims Wempe was accused of molesting in June.

"I am just so sorry this had to happen, you know, that these kinds of things happened," Wempe said after he was released the following month. "I'm happy that it's been dismissed."

Wempe's church personnel files were among those demanded by the Los Angeles County Grand Jury. The archdiocese has fought the release of documents reflecting communications between top church officials and priests, claiming it would violate their civil rights.

Los Angeles County Dist. Atty. Steve Cooley said the Wempe case "underscores the importance of ongoing litigation with the Los Angeles Archdiocese relative to records sought as criminal evidence in allegations of priests abusing children."




I got the job because
CareerBuilder.com did the
searching for me.

CareerBuilder.com
The smarter way to find a better job.

Saturday, May 6, 2006

latimes.com/california

SIXTH FLOOR, 1200 WEST 6TH ST., LOS ANGELES, CALIF. 90017-1400



SENTENCED: Retired priest Michael Wempe smiles at Judge Curtis B. Rappe as he is taken away. He got the maximum sentence but has served about 600 days, so he will be in prison about a year more.

GENARO MOLINA Los Angeles Times

Priest Gets 3 Years in Molestation

Michael Wempe's case, the first major trial in the L.A. Archdiocese's sex abuse scandal, ends as settlement talks with hundreds continue.

By JESSICA GARRISON
AND JONATHAN ABRAMS
Times Staff Writers

A pedophile priest whom Cardinal Roger M. Mahony returned to the ministry after learning of his interest in children was sentenced to three years in prison Friday, bringing to a close Los Angeles' first high-profile trial since the church's abuse scandal exploded four years ago.

Father Michael Edwin Wempe, 66, was led into court in handcuffs and sat expressionless in his brown county jail jumpsuit as Judge Curtis B. Rappe told him he would have to register as a sex offender for life because of his conviction for molesting a 16-year-old boy.

The retired priest agreed not to appeal or seek a new trial. In exchange, the district attorney's office will not retry him on four other counts of molestation that his jury was unable to decide.

He was given the maximum sentence, but has already served about 600 days and so will be in prison for only about a year more — a sentence that some of his victims said was far too short.

Wempe has admitted to sexually abusing 13 boys during his 36-year career in the Los Angeles Archdiocese, but he could be tried only for molesting a single boy because the other crimes were too old. In the current case,

he had denied abusing the younger brother of two men he had acknowledged molesting as youths.

"At long last, you will be introduced to some measure of justice," the older brother of the victim in this case told Wempe during the sentencing hearing. He and other victims who testified also had harsh words for the archdiocese and Mahony.

"If the archdiocese had done the right thing ... I would have been spared years of despondency," he added. "Because of this, they bear as much responsibility for your crimes as you do."

Wempe's hair and beard were scruffy and he appeared much thinner than during his February trial. In the probation report [See Priest, Page B10]

CALIFORNIA

Priest Receives 3-Year Term for Molesting Boy

[Priest, from Page B1]

submitted during sentencing, officials noted that the retired priest is a diabetic who had open heart surgery in 1999 and takes daily medication. The report also said Wempe has been taking Prozac for three years "to calm his nerves."

Wempe did not testify at his trial, but in his probation report, officers wrote that he had said "this case has not only hurt him, but it has hurt the priesthood."

"He related that he does not want to hurt the priesthood and he does not want to hurt the church," the report said.

The trial focused renewed attention on the cardinal's handling of molesting priests. Mahony sent Wempe to therapy in 1987 after doubts arose about his questionable behavior, but allowed him to remain a priest until 2002 without warning parishioners. The therapy came more than 20 years after Wempe was ordained and more than 15 years after his first admitted victims entered his life.

Archdiocese spokesman Tod Tamberg said Friday the church hoped "that this conviction and sentencing brings some measure of healing to his victims."

He added that the "archdiocese has expressed remorse and asked for forgiveness for mistakes it made in dealing with Father Wempe."

Wempe's trial comes as attorneys for the archdiocese are in settlement talks with more than 560 people suing the church for failing to protect them from abuse by priests.

Such a settlement probably would reach into the hundreds of millions of dollars and break records.

The case also marked the first time that victims of a serial abuser came into open court to testify. Prosecutors had filed cases against nearly a dozen Los Angeles priests in 2003, but they were dismissed when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a state law that had lifted the statute of limitations for child abuse

prosecutions.

On Friday, Wempe's attorney, Leonard Levine, said the retired priest would make no statement of remorse or address the court in any way because of civil litigation pending against him.

Outside the courtroom, Levine again denied that the priest had committed the crime for which he was convicted.

"Since 1986, we believe Michael has not molested any individuals. There have been no allegations except for the one person who came forward. We believe the evidence was and is there to dispute that allegation, but we accept the jury's verdict and the sentence and will move on."

But Wempe's victims said the sentence was far too lenient given the pain he has caused.

"I am here today to tell you how one man — Michael Wempe — has damaged . . . our family as a whole," testified the mother of two of Wempe's victims. She recalled how he entered their lives the year her husband died and then took advantage of her sons.

Turning to Wempe, she said: "You have given so much grief and misery to us, and we are only one family."

Wempe sat expressionless and did not make eye contact with any of the speakers. But his sister, who faithfully sat through the trial, got up and left the courtroom at that point.

Prosecutor Todd Hicks said he did not know where Wempe would serve his time. That determination will be made in the next few weeks by the state Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

In Massachusetts, defrocked pedophile priest John Geoghan — despite being in protective custody — was murdered in prison by an inmate who said he had been abused as a child.

After serving his time, Wempe's probation report says, he plans to return to his condominium in Seal Beach where he cares for his aging mother. He still has a \$1,500 monthly pension from the church.